

Anatoli Lunacharsky



On Education

*Selected Articles
and Speeches*

Progress Publishers



ANATOLI LUNACHARSKY

On Education

*Selected Articles
and Speeches*



*Progress Publishers
Moscow*

Compiler and author of notes *E. Dneprov*
Translated from the Russian by *Ruth English*
Designed by *Nikolai Pashura*

А. В. ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ

«Об образовании и воспитании»

Сборник статей и выступлений

(составитель и автор комментариев Э. Д. Днепроv)

На английском языке

370.10447
LUN

26.8.94

8727

First printing 1981

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1981

English translation © Progress Publishers, 1981

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Л 60300 - 604
014(01) - 81 65 - 81

4305000000

CONTENTS

TO THE READER	5
FROM THE EDITOR	8
SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS ON EDUCATION	10
ON SOCIAL EDUCATION	31
WHAT IS EDUCATION?	45
COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	59
THE TASKS OF EXTRA-MURAL EDUCATION IN SOVIET RUSSIA	65
ON THE CLASS SCHOOL	82
THE ROLE OF THE WORKERS' FACULTIES (RABFAKS)	110
WHAT KIND OF SCHOOL DOES THE PROLETARIAN STATE NEED?	119
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOL AND THE REVOLUTION	145
THE TASKS OF EDUCATION WITHIN THE SYSTEM OF SOVIET CONSTRUCTION	170
THE ART OF THE WORD IN SCHOOL	197

SOCIOLOGICAL PREMISES
OF SOVIET EDUCATIONAL THEORY
206

EDUCATION OF THE NEW MAN
217

THE EDUCATIONAL TASKS
OF THE SOVIET SCHOOL
242

SUPPLEMENT:

A. V. LUNACHARSKY: A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE
264

NOTES
266

NAME INDEX
327

To the Reader

The book now offered for your attention represents the legacy left us in the field of education by Anatoli Lunacharsky, who was a major public figure in affairs of state and of society, and made an invaluable contribution to the development of socialist culture and enlightenment.

Lunacharsky was nominated by V. I. Lenin to take up the post of People's Commissar for Education,* and he, along with other prominent people in the field of education, succeeded in laying the foundation—under the uncommonly difficult conditions of the first years of Soviet government—of a new educational system, and in working out the basic principles, theoretical and practical, for building a Soviet school. Under Lenin's direct guidance, Lunacharsky worked to materialise the principles of the universal, polytechnical labour school and created an extensive system of preschool education, vocational and higher education, and of institutions of a general cultural and educational nature.

Lunacharsky's educational principles draw their strength and their power to convince from the facts that they are grounded in Marxist-Leninist ideology and that he links questions of education closely with the problems of social, political and economic life. Lunacharsky's articles and speeches give a profoundly scientific, Marxist substantiation for the organisational forms of the school system, they define the aims of education and the demands to the content and the methods of teaching. Lunacharsky contributed significantly to the solution of such important educational problems as the relationships between school and life, the individual and the collective, the individual and society. The school, Lunacharsky considered, must be the most important factor in education, and the basic aim of the lat-

*The term then used meant, literally, "enlightenment"—the same word as in the previous sentence.—*Tr.*

ter he saw as the all-round development of the individual personality.

The individual is the ultimate value in a socialist society, Lunacharky affirmed. "We want," he wrote, "to educate a human being who morally and spiritually should attain the greatest possible harmony, who should be as fully educated as possible, and should be able easily to achieve high skill in any single field. It is also our intention to create a person who will be a true fellow-worker and well-wisher to his fellow-citizens, we want to create a comrade to all other men and a fighter—for as long as the struggle continues—for the socialist ideal."

A passionate faith in a bright and beautiful future runs through all that Lunacharsky did. In the grim years of the Civil War, economic chaos and famine he never ceased to dream of the ideal human being—"physically beautiful, harmoniously developing, widely educated, acquainted with the basic facts and the most important conclusions to be drawn from these in widely differing areas of knowledge—technology, medicine, civil law, literature, etc."

A clear vision of the future, solutions for pressing tasks found by the light of the opening prospects of building socialism—these are characteristic of Lunacharsky. A sober assessment of the difficulties of the period never blunted the keenness of his eye for what would be tomorrow. "We cannot allow the current difficulties of the moment," he said "to trample down the flowers of the proletariat's first hopes that all-round development of human beings is possible." It was from this standpoint that Lunacharsky fought for the socialist school to have a general educational character, and for it to be a polytechnical school.

The Soviet school has advanced a long way since the time when its foundations were being worked out. But the main principles of the Soviet school have retained their enduring validity up to our own time.

Lunacharsky's insight gives a contemporary ring to much that he said half a century ago. Especially apt for today are his remarks on links between school and life and on the very direct relevance to economic and political problems of constructive work in the cultural field.

The Lunacharsky legacy in education is undoubtedly of great importance in advancing our knowledge, because it

sheds so clear a light, and from so many angles, on the history of the formative years of Soviet education. One cannot but think that creative use of this legacy may assist in solving many contemporary educational problems, and in other countries of the world besides our own.

That is one of the objects of this present volume.

*Mikhail Prokofiev,
Minister of Education of the USSR*

From the Editor

This book includes fourteen works by Anatoli Lunacharsky on matters of education, in the widest sense; this is only a modest part of the legacy he left us in this field. At the same time, these works give a sufficiently full idea of the character of this legacy, of its scale and of its theoretical and practical significance.

For Lunacharsky there were no educational problems which were of theoretical or of practical interest only. He saw the whole complex of these problems in its unity and indivisibility, and he approached their solution as a statesman, as a theoretician, and as a practical worker. This is a characteristic feature of his personality and of his creative activities as an educationalist.

Any task, even the most limited and most practical of tasks, was transfused by Lunacharsky with "the spirit of scientific socialism" and subordinated to the general tasks of building socialism; this enabled him to bring out the essence of any educational phenomenon and its place in the overall social and educational process. Such an approach is brought out by the very titles of most of the works offered here—"The Philosophy of the School and the Revolution", "What Kind of School Does the Proletarian State Require", "The Tasks of Education Within the System of Soviet Construction", "Sociological Premises of Soviet Pedagogics", etc.

Lunacharsky saw distinctly the general strategy for the school. From the tasks dictated by that strategy he then went on to approach the concrete problems of schooling and education as a whole. The logic of this progression is to be seen in his every work. The organic fusion of the tasks facing the revolution and education, the revolution and the school, the revolution and pedagogical science—this is the fundamental tenor of Lunacharsky's activities in the fields of formal education and of all education, this

represents Lunacharsky's main role as one of the first Marxist educationalists in the history of education.

The works published here bring out different aspects of the problem "the revolution and education": how it emerges in political, social, and cultural terms; the educational content of its message. The reader can follow from one article to the next the development and the enrichment of Lunacharsky's educational ideas—from the works dating from the first years of the Revolution and devoted to problems of "the philosophy of the school" and to urgent tasks of a social and organisational as well as of an educational nature, to the works of the late 1920s, which shed light on the methodological bases of scientific pedagogics, on cardinal issues of the theory of education, the teaching process, and some particular matters of method.

Through all the works collected in this volume, there run the principal, leading ideas of Lunacharsky's creative work as an educationalist: education as the basis of culture; its indissoluble connection with the tasks of economics and politics; the general school as the foundation of a socialist education system; the creation of the polytechnical labour school as the central task of the development of the school; the individual as the ultimate value in a socialist society, etc. These ideas, indeed all Lunacharsky's work as People's Commissar for Education, exerted a beneficial influence on the development of the Soviet school and of Soviet pedagogics, on the whole progress of the social and educational life of the socialist state.

SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS ON EDUCATION

Comrades, permit me on behalf of the Commissariat for Education to welcome the delegates of educational bodies here assembled, and to proceed at once and immediately to the report of that Commissariat. I do not want to make an official speech here, I simply want to ask you forthwith to get on with our discussion of business, and this must, of course, be preceded by a report. And here it is self-evident that the task facing the Commissariat over the last ten or nearly ten months, the bringing into working order of the apparatus of our Commissariat, and the work already done by it, is something so far-reaching that it cannot be set out in any sort of detail in any spoken report, and you will therefore receive in some days the known plan of that work, in printed form, and quite extensive additional material, which you can use in our discussions.

My report will be in effect an introduction, and I shall only endeavour to indicate the general direction of our work, to mark some milestones, to acquaint you with this extensive field in general terms.

Comrades, it is for us axiomatic that the struggle of the people for its freedom and its well-being proceeds along three lines. The people can account itself victorious, as having attained full power of the people, when it is in possession of the means of production and in possession of knowledge. Any of these conditions is insufficient without the other. This is understood not only by us, by revolutionary socialists, but by any more or less consistent democrat, and in the United States of America, for example, when they had gained their independence, their very first president noted that if the people did not have a sufficient scope of knowledge at command, then democracy would not be free.¹

The eighteenth century realised that political power and equality before the law were not enough, if knowledge

was lacking. But that century did not understand that, equally, any political and cultural programme would remain a good intention only, unless it was based upon the transference into society's hands of the means of production. Only later did life make it clear that the slogan "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is unthinkable not only in an ignorant society, but in any society other than a socialist one. Now we know that people's government, the genuine power of the actual majority, is conceivable only given all these three conditions: governmental power (so long as this is needed anyway, until the state shall annul it), economic power, and the transmission of knowledge to every man, i.e. wide educational work resulting in maximum consciousness of the masses.

Political power can be taken quickly; it usually passes into new hands by means of a *coup*. Contradictions gradually accumulate between the economic and cultural level of a country and its political forms. The political forms hang on until the moment of explosion arrives; then new classes take political power into their own hands by revolutionary means. Since the process of organisation of government casts light on school problems also, I shall dwell on this in a few words.

When a political revolution takes place, the organisation of the new government does not appear difficult. In February/March the people deposed the old government. But the whole bureaucratic machinery remained intact, and the Provisional Government proposed to govern using this old apparatus, for the revolution was by them seen as a political act, the result of which was to be reforms only². Politically this was a revolution, in real terms it was only a series of pathetic—highly pathetic—reforms. It is another matter when a revolution is of a social nature. Such was the case in France, for instance, where there were democratic strata which had not shared in the governmental power to any extent whatever; in no way could they make use of the old state machinery in the future. In order to render harmless the old state machinery, they had to destroy it and create a new one; this is of course a painful and a prolonged process. But the French Revolution could make better use of the forces of the intelligentsia, for there the intelligentsia belonged to the grouping into whose hands pow-

er had passed. In this country the intelligentsia almost to a man enrolled itself among the reformists, among those who attempted after the February Revolution to preserve the old system in a reformed version.

When there came a new revolution, the October Revolution, the peasantry and the proletariat came forward without any skills in government, being as far removed from this as can be imagined. The process of building up a state government, a process which was painful and terrible even in the eighteenth century, had to be carried through by us with even greater difficulty. We are still in the crucible of this work of creation, we cannot say that our state apparatus is complete. We have a constitution, which we look on as provisional³, and an apparatus of defence, which is essential at the present time. Yet in the course of ten months we, working amid unheard-of difficulties, have accomplished an immense work.

Before us lies the task of transferring all wealth to the hands of the people. We all know that the first instinct of a people in revolt, if that people is insufficiently disciplined, if it is uneducated, is to gain possession of wealth. But this is often expressed in attempts to gain possession of it on the part of the one who stands nearest, the one who has been suffering in poverty at the very threshold of some rich palace. And so that every man may not have his knife out against his neighbour, they try to break up or give out that wealth as quickly as possible. This urge to share it out in little pieces made itself felt in the highest degree during the French Revolution; it takes place here too. Here we have the instinct to grab, an instinct which does not reason; this grabbing by the hungry is unorganised and ruinous for the revolution. Here too we have the petty individualism of the kulak, aiming to create equal, small economies on the basis of liberation from the old regime. And here, too, there lives the great idea of Communism, inherited by us from our teachers world-wide. These teachers call for us not only to consider the Russian economy as a single, people's economy, but to realise it as such.

This is a road which demands education in the highest degree, a vast scope of knowledge, and exceptional self-control. Of course, those who want to see only the reverse

side, the smashed crockery, will moan and groan. But honest observers, who can turn attention on the solid and lasting qualities of the foundation, will understand us, and we can say that never on earth has work been done that will bear such fruit as the work of these months in which it is our good fortune to live. The same applies to the schools; we know very well that by no means can the people get state and social life working correctly, by no means can it assume real direction of the economy, unless it is provided with all the knowledge essential for so doing. The effort to build a new school is the third and no less important condition.

When I was appointed Commissar for Education, I could not but feel the colossal responsibility which the people was laying upon me. The task is to carry through, with utmost rapidity and utmost breadth, the transmission to the people of knowledge, to destroy the privileged right to knowledge allowed before to only a small part of society. And here it was just as immediately apparent that it was not a matter of getting control of the schools: the schools were just as decrepit and good for nothing as the bureaucratic apparatus. We could not reckon, as the Provisional Government did, that we would recommend to the district inspectors that certain changes should be made; we had to wipe out everything; it was absolutely clear that the school was due for a revolutionary shake-up. I shall not say "for destruction and re-creation", because the schools as an existing apparatus are by no means due for destruction, and we could not in actual fact shut down the schools for a certain time, simply dismiss their staffs and build something new.

The bankruptcy of the old school was only too clear, but within the old school there was the progressive teacher, who was dissatisfied with the old system and desired to re-cast it. Such teachers had their own ideal, a school more perfect than that which existed in Russia, and they created a certain apparatus or organisation of their own, known as the State Committee on Education, which was preparing a whole series of reforms under the Provisional Government⁴. But the Provisional Government was a government incompetent to the last degree. It had no definite programme, and each new minister in a constant stream

of changing ministers would promise the State Committee that something would be done. We knew that there was such a thing as the State Committee, that there was a number of progressive teachers; we were aware that our school reform did not coincide with theirs, that it would go further, that it was the further continuation of the task of producing a human being more educated, more disciplined, more in harmony with the life of society. Now there are no more ministers of education. Now the power of the state has but one task: to give the people, as quickly as possible, the greatest possible amount of knowledge, to cope with the gigantic role which the Revolution has prepared for the people. Previously teachers did not speak out full-voiced; they were afraid of the ministers, thinking that if they did that they would be hounded out: but now they could have come to an agreement.

In the first days after I had become Commissar for Education and had brought in five or six of the persons best prepared for this work, I addressed myself to the teachers, requesting them to come to our aid⁵. I indicated in general outline how I saw the tasks facing the schools, and asked the teachers to cast politics aside and come to work with us in schools given a new face. I was prepared to give the State Committee a much bigger role than it had been allowed before. I promised that no measures would be put in hand by me without previous consultation with the teachers: the answer was the most ferocious sabotage. There was a definite decision to await the rapid demise of "this hateful revolution", which they considered to be not of the people, and the return of the old, pre-October order of things, so that they could make of the schools what they would need when the bourgeoisie returned to power. The hope of peaceful constructive work in the schools fell to the ground. In Petrograd we were able to avoid the reef of strike action; but in Moscow a strike took place, and has left traces deeper than those following our first conflict in Petrograd.

A profound mutual hostility and misunderstanding opened up between the teachers and the people. It became necessary to postpone reform of the schools, to map out ways of achieving it which would by-pass the progressive teachers and rely on the action of the people themselves. It is

our aim to make that reform accord with the interests of the working masses, and we shall go to them, by-passing the bottle-neck which the Teachers' Union has been making of itself ⁶.

We knew very well that we could replace these people with others, but we needed to hand over affairs, to hand over the machinery, and we found empty rooms, empty school halls ⁷. Now these people who did not see fit to come to us are begging our permission, in the most demeaning manner, to come back. If the teachers have received no pay, if there has been no liaison with the teaching body, if chaos has been caused in the whole organisation of the Commissariat for Education, if we have spent almost a year going out of our way in a vain attempt to get down to business—the fault lies with those who refused to hand over to us. In Petrograd we had just barely got the apparatus into functioning order, barely dared to think that we could now live in real earnest and that the new machine could now actually turn out a product, when the German invasion began. It was necessary to transfer a considerable part of the Commissariat over here, to organise a major department for the North in Petrograd, and to get organised here, in a new place, with new people. ⁸ You of course know what evacuation means, what it means to transfer all those papers, funds, archives, etc.

Different times are now with us; we can work more or less normally, we can repeat "The danger is over", but still great difficulties lie before us.

Not for nothing has the people of Russia—workers and peasants—produced from out its inmost depths several thousand people who have assumed the functions of Soviet government. They represent a creative force. We are not afraid of difficulties. No difficulties will be insuperable to Soviet Russia. But there is a danger of another kind: the struggle, the fight with the foe that has just been overthrown but is still ready to raise its head again... This atmosphere of war, the need to strain all one's powers—this is our greatest difficulty. We must bear this in mind all the time as we organise our work. None the less, the Commissariat has assumed a definite, completed form, regular relations with the provinces are being established, the teaching body is moving more and more in the direction of

working together with us, and we must now get on with real work, we must map out the reform of the schools in its main outlines, in order to demonstrate that a revolution has indeed taken place in the schools, and that their master now is none other than the working people.

In the first place of all, we had to provide a proper charter for the authority responsible for education. It could not be of an old-style bureaucratic character. We want true people's government, i.e. the transfer of all power to the masses of the people. Our line is this: to arouse the interest of the population at large in school affairs, to so order things that teachers should be elected and checked up on by the local population, which, organised in committees or councils should be the ultimate judge.⁹ We knew that in many places we would not be understood; those strata of the people which have communist sympathies would go along with us, but the whole mass of the petty bourgeoisie, the mass of the peasantry or its unenlightened portion, those who do not understand the bearing of the new reform, who see only trouble, whose urge is in a backward direction—and this mass is an exceedingly great one—they would not come to meet our reform halfway, and for this reason the final answer to many school problems must still be given by the government.

A people sunk in ignorance cannot receive full self-government, and the precondition of people's government is possible only given enlightenment of those same masses to which power is to be given. Until this is achieved, the way out which must be chosen is "enlightened absolutism". There is no power of the intelligentsia. There must be power of the vanguard of the people, of that part of the people which represents the interests, correctly understood, of the majority; of that part of the people in which its creative strength lies. That creative strength or power is the proletariat, and the present form of government cannot but be a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under Russian conditions, this dictatorship would be impossible, if we did not know that the interests of the proletariat coincide with the interests of the peasant population, the interests of the poor peasantry. The proletariat and the poor peasantry are out of themselves producing an especial state machinery—the dictatorship of the proletar-

iat—which is the heart and the brain of the people. The small-peasant population, which did not understand the true tasks of democracy, has not understood the reform of the schools either. It has been frightened by the separation of church from state and of school from church,¹⁰ and has viewed our reforms as something imposed from outside. We could not hand the whole undertaking over to the population at large, because it was not prepared. When we saw that the population was not coping with the given task, we had to correct its decision, to guide it, and in this respect we were acting as the people's assistants, saying to them, "Look, this is what workers' and peasants' government really means."

In countries with a higher cultural level the task would have been easier. We here had to achieve our aims by slower means; we had to organise local government, struggle with prejudices among the masses, and to show not only in words but in deeds that the school of the future, the labour school, does correspond to the interests of the people. We had to make that school a reality at all costs, and we are certain that when it has existed for two years all the prejudices which have been induced previously among the masses will be broken down, and people will say "Thank you" to us for it.

Until we have achieved all this, the old body of teachers, the religious instructors, and the more conservative-minded parents, will resist our reforms by all possible means. Proceeding from these considerations, we have brought into being local commissions, delegate bodies including representatives of democratic organisations. We could not invite into these bodies our enemies, who do not agree with us or even when they do agree, will certainly do everything to prevent us being successful, those to whom it is important that our every failure should be an argument to be used against us, a bullet to be hurled at the head of the Soviet Government. From this angle, to let in alien elements here would have been equivalent to bringing enemy officers into one's own fortress. But among these enemies there are technical specialists, people who know their business. From this angle we were obliged to utilise such forces, but to counter-balance them we have given the guiding role to departments of Soviet institutions.

Alongside the departments (of education) within the Soviets of Workers' Deputies we have created Councils for Education,¹¹ in which a wider representation of hostile elements is admitted. We knew very well that this was dangerous, but we took this path because we want to build up contact with the broad masses, we want propaganda to continue ceaselessly, making our views get through to people. In this way we shall make out of our enemies, whatever their feelings when they first came to us, sincere fellow-workers. And we are already seeing the fruits of this measure. People get carried away by the work, and I have heard more than once from those who have "given way" remarks like, "Once one gets to work with you, one feels one must go on till victory or till death, because the grandeur of the thing sweeps you up." And every decent, intelligent person who is capable of creative action will find his place with us and become a fellow-worker, one who maybe is not in complete agreement with what we are doing, but who under common conditions will become our brother, our friend and comrade. That is what we counted on, and we think that even in those places where these Councils are not altogether measuring up to the tasks laid upon them, even there they are an effective means of bringing into action some of those who have the greatest interest in the changes already made in the schools. Our principle is—the minimum of "police" violence, the minimum pressure on the masses, and the maximum of explanatory work. When, sooner or later, the prejudices are overcome, everyone will see the ardent love and true understanding of the people's interests which have guided us.

The faith with which we approached our work will help us to overcome our enemies and demonstrate our right, our truth. The best propaganda of all is the evidence of facts, but only a government which is truly of the people can be so bold as to allow itself such propaganda.

Now, after that general outline, I shall pass on to a description of the machinery we have set up to replace the old Ministry of Education. I shall enumerate some of the most important decrees we have issued. First of all, we did away with the remains of the old apparatus, discontinuing the posts of district guardians, directors and inspectors of schools.¹² This reform had been in preparation for several

years; we completed it in earnest. Then it was necessary to remove from the schools features which were unacceptable to us, and we issued the decree forbidding the teaching of Scripture, and removing Latin from the curriculum; we did away with matriculation as such, replacing it with certificates attesting that courses in sciences had been followed; we abolished the award of marks, and introduced co-education of the sexes. Any teacher will admit all these reforms to be an essential condition for anything approaching a normal school.¹³

And we had only removed the rubbish weighing down the school, only freed it from some only too evident deformations. After that we must set about the real, creative reform of the school.

I have to say that in the given case I had not expected any resistance or protest against these reforms, but they did evoke a deep split among teachers. I am not saying that pedagogical science as such is against our views on the school, on the contrary, we are drawing from that science a conclusion that begs to be drawn. So what is the problem?

Of course, only one objective truth exists for each given period, but it would seem that not every class dares to accept the whole of that truth. Only the proletariat is bold enough to do that, while the bourgeoisie accepts science only so far as it is profitable to it to do so. When science reaches conclusions which are disastrous, lethal for their class, the bourgeoisie closes its eyes to them. It is a peculiar sort of blindness, which allows one to see as far up as the shoulders, but not to see the head. And here matters of pedagogics were no exception.

The bourgeoisie cannot accept a school for the working people, a school accessible to all. The bourgeoisie cannot accept those new forms in education which make it easier to achieve the very result which is sought after by every true teacher. A little while ago I took part in a debate with some priests,¹⁴ and was pleased when they declared that the previous regime did not correspond to the ideals of Christianity, that socialism is "the true understanding of Christianity and its ideals". This merely indicates that the regime, which trained these officers for itself, was unable even to use its own weapons. In spite of all the bans,

in spite of all the means used to pervert its servants, it was only able to call forth protests from them against itself.

Very different is the ability of the bourgeoisie to use science for its own ends, and the stronger it is, the more imposing is the edifice constructed, and the better it is able to blind the people, who will be quite prepared to believe that these are indeed the true conclusions of science. In America, that most cultured of countries, this skill reaches its highest point. There the form of government is such that it can be taken for a real people's state. Every citizen of America says that in their country the people rules. He says this, even after his eight-hour working day, after he has spent the eight hours watering a machine with the sweat of his brow; he will say it on his way home, to where he lives in a room on the tenth floor; he will say it in front of a mansion belonging to, say, a Rockefeller, where wealthy folk spend thousands in a day. Even there he will say that yes, they have real government by the people. And this only because in America the bourgeoisie has been able to make full use of all the means at its disposal, has succeeded in exploiting science to make the people, too, see only as far up as the shoulders, and not see the head. The bourgeoisie has brought all available means into play to pull the wool over the whole world's eyes, and today it is no secret to anyone that for this it employs, for one thing, the class character of the school, and for another, it tries to interpret objective truth in such a way that it will profit only that class. The school has been worked out to a scheme of producing people of two grades; in this respect the most advanced countries have achieved amazing success. There all available means are brought into play in order to use science to justify the crime and turn those whose whole lifeblood is being sucked dry into watchmen defending the crime and protecting the robbery. This training of two grades of people, which the bourgeoisie's instinct of self-preservation dictates, is for us a curse.

Clearly we, who have destroyed class culture, can create only a single, unified school. There can be no place in it for the trend which has been directed to making a man the obedient tool of the ruling class. From this point of view I say to teachers who do not belong to the bourgeois clas-

ses, and in particular to teacher-democrats, that they will go along with us. Not without justification has it been said that a true man of science feels the advance of socialism to be, as it were, a liberation from captivity. Insofar as he is a professor and an Actual State Councillor* he has an interest in the gilded cage in which he sits, but insofar as he is a real man of science and a progressive teacher he knows that the cage prevents him from spreading out his wings. He languishes in it, and when he senses that he has been released from it, it may be a frightening feeling but he will thank us for it.

We want to liberate the teacher and bring him back to the role of his vocation—producing people, and not just individualists, but people who will be an element in the sum of human justice. This is, for us, the task of the ideal school.

Some representatives of the progressive bourgeoisie in Norway¹⁵ have brought into being a unified school. But this school does not have the inner soul which would make it not only unified but also a people's school from top to bottom. To give to this unity the imprint of the force, the virtue, and the essential being that lies in the people, it is vital that the school should also be truly a school of labour. We carried through our revolution under the banner of labour. For us this revolution is not a matter of getting rid of labour, for outside of labour life is merely a name. Our idea does not lie towards not working, but towards distributing work correctly.

A man lives not in order to labour, but he labours in order to live like a human being. In this vocation within man's nature lies his touch of the divine, his dignity, that which distinguishes him from the animals, for an animal does not have consciousness. Man is a labourer, and nature is his material. His calling is to change nature to accord with his ideal. Karl Marx's words are indeed precious, that up to now science has only interpreted the world, our task is to change it.¹⁶

Every man must be a labouring man, for whom science is only a support, for whom knowledge serves as a preliminary preparation for labour, to make it useful, and direct-

*A high official rank under tsarism.—Tr.

26.8.94

ed along the line defined by the human ideal. This is why we make our school a labour school (and here we in part join up with the bourgeoisie, but in part differ from it). As I said, the intelligent bourgeoisie, realising that Latin will not get you very far, has spoken through the mouth of Wilhelm II as follows—"Kindly give me as many people with technical qualifications as you can from your schools, and to hell with Greek and Latin. We cannot wait, we have wars to fight..."¹⁷

The most progressive teachers are close to what we are now putting into practice; we of course, will make full use of all that they give us. We accept labour as a subject of study, i.e. study of the full range of technical subjects. We also accept labour as an educational method, for we know that only through collective labour can we inculcate a whole series of qualities of character which are essential if the personality is to be stable and valuable. We accept labour also as participation by young people and children in the general process of labour in which the population as a whole is engaged. A child must realise that labour is no joke, that this is the element by which society is maintained; he must feel himself to be a small worker within the mighty element of collaboration. But we cannot allow that collaboration to proceed in an uneconomical manner. We shall see to it that this labour is kept of such a nature that it can, with gentle care, make out of a little person a full-grown worker in a socialist society.

I shall say comparatively little about the scientific education which will be given in our future school; the same subjects which are now included in the school curriculum will be there, but we have the possibility of drawing them together towards certain unifying centres. We know that human society in its historical development has been inseparably woven together with nature, that labour is the very root from which natural science, i.e. the study of nature, grows. The one and only subject of study that there is, in fact, is human culture, for the natural sciences enter into human culture as the reflection of nature in man's consciousness at every stage of his development.

The history of human culture is inextricably linked with nature. It is the science we have studied best of all, and there is no science which is not a branch sprung from it.

Such an approach is dictated to us by Marxism, but some eminent teachers who had nothing in common with Marxism have come close to the same approach. Every teacher has said that the world is the only subject of study, and that it must be studied in such a way that it does not become fragmented in the child's consciousness. Nature is an entity, and for this reason during the early stages of the child's development the boundaries separating one "subject" from another must be erased to a great extent. When the foundation has been laid, a greater degree of differentiation becomes possible. By then we shall not be afraid that someone studying mathematics will not understand in what relation all that stands to human nature.

Alongside scientific education, alongside the development of human thought through the perception of knowledge and through methodical study of labour, an immensely important part must also be played by physical education. We shall not confine ourselves to labour only for this purpose, because labour (inasmuch as it is aimed at accomplishing an external task) does not yet make man entirely free. Man has another task too—to develop his body. This is work, done on one's own body, to make it flexible, healthy, beautiful. It can proceed along the lines laid down by the hygienists; these include a whole number of special exercises to make a person healthy.

Of course aesthetic education cannot be left out; we understand it as the development of man's creative impulses towards beauty. A basic task of man is to make himself and all around him beautiful. Labour in general does not give a sense of free life. It should be our ideal to give that life the maximum of joy. All the devices by which man can make all around him elegant, beautiful, compact of joy—all this must be the subject of aesthetic education, and this too demands technical skill in the presentation. Perhaps in future times the very act of birth will be the occasion for people to apply techniques which may be able to kill off the effects of bad heredity. From the time it is born a child must be the object of society's care and efforts to make it as strong and as physically able as possible, for it is that physical ability which as a result gives what we call the beautiful.

From this point of view aesthetic education occupies a

special place, and the very word "aesthetics" acquires a particularly important meaning. If someone is to be able to perceive what is beautiful in the sphere of hearing or of sight, he must first learn himself how to create things in them. All this represents tasks of immense magnitude, which we cannot by-pass. One of the school subjects which has often been accounted "aesthetic"—drawing and modelling—is in fact not this alone. One cannot consider as educated someone unable to express his thought in the form of at least a rough working drawing or sketch. This is as necessary for the teacher, who cannot teach without such live illustration, as for the pupil. Aesthetic education is tied in with technical and with physical education in our view. Thus when we teach carpentry or metalwork we do not want only to teach a boy a trade, we want to teach him to be a human being of beauty, able to build a life with beauty.

That is how socialists see the school of the future. When properly trained teachers are teaching in it, they will take care that when they are giving a lesson in drawing they are also bearing the children's physical education in mind, and will organise their lesson so that it brings them joy and not fatigue. This method is the only possible one for our profoundly humane view of the world.

On school government too I have some words to say. Here the important point is this: to order it in such a way that the attitudes of teachers and parents to the new school should not turn out as sabotage of it. One has only to hand over the schools completely to the teachers and the parents and they will resurrect the old school and turn people into spiritual cripples again. This we cannot allow. We do, however, want the teaching staff to seek for and put into practice in their schools all manner of experiments. We do not want all the schools in all gubernias and uyezds to be on one and the same model; on the contrary, the more variety the better, although of course we can admit variety only within certain limits. One must not compel children to sit at desks for several hours on end, and force them to breathe in dust and bad air. That would be not variety but deformity.*

*In Russian this is a play on two words with the same root—*raznoobraziye* and *bezobraziye*.—Tr.

For us it is important that the teacher should be the most all-round person, the finest person in the state, for he must make of himself a source of joyful transformation for the minors who are in a process of gradual development of their own powers. This is the high calling of the teacher, and it is beyond question that no other profession makes such demands upon one. The teacher has to make real in his own person the ideal of humanity. At the same time the teacher, being a specialist, may be a little one-sided, and for this reason parents too must be drawn into school government.

The third element in the self-government of the school are the pupils themselves. We want to extend this self-government as widely as possible; we want not only students but senior school pupils too to run their school in concert with their parents and their teachers. Everywhere that a senior pupil can exert his independence, let him do so. Let the children themselves manage their children's affairs. One must try and influence them in such a way that they should be capable of organising their own collectives, and that the common spirit of solidarity should always oblige the mistaken few to return to the true path. One of the most humane of pedagogues, coming across this phenomenon, has said that neither church nor school today can educate a healthy young generation. He said that collectives consisting of the young themselves must be created. Only such organisations of youth can now save Germany from crimes and suicides.¹⁸ It is boredom that propels towards mischief of all kinds, senseless tricks, grotesque and disgraceful actions; where cheerful work is going on, there is less need to fear such things. Let pupils themselves take on the greatest possible number of jobs and duties of all sorts; in that way they train themselves for self-government. Lastly, children must be given full freedom to organise societies—for scientific research, for gymnastics, for musical activities—and theatres, and to create all manner of journals, political clubs, etc. Best let the teachers keep out of them, so that the presence of an adult should not inhibit the children in their search for their own road.

Concerning reform of higher education, I shall say only that at a conference on this subject which took place recent-

ly¹⁹ we consulted with Messrs. the professors, and they graciously agreed to a common plan. We for our part with all sincerity made certain concessions, in the interests of getting on with the business. We know that everything will not be achieved all at once, and they on their side demonstrated a certain ability and readiness to feel respect for a reform which many of them found rational. But a memorandum which we received a little while ago indicates that Messrs. the professors are now ready to take back all their concessions. They declare that the university is what it used to be, and that there must be no reforms. This coincided with some failures of ours on the Eastern front and with the appearance of certain prospects relating to Nikolai Romanov.²⁰ Perhaps time will bring a cure for this unexpected relapse affecting the learned gentlemen. But if this should not happen, we must declare straight out that we will carry our reform through without them. We will go to those professors who will take the viewpoint already taken by many, when they said that they saw nothing new in our reform, that they had always wanted it.

Yes, you wanted it, but the government did not give it you, and now the government is giving it you but you for some reason do not want it. From this angle it could be very important for this congress to sanction some measures from which Messrs. the professors may conclude that their resistance means a declaration of war against the elemental force of the Russian Revolution. That declaration of war will be accepted by us, and if the professors think it is within their power to barricade themselves in behind their autonomy and command "Stop, do not enter our circle, Russian Revolution!" they are making a mistake. It would be better to do all this by common agreement. All the more so since the arguments already advanced had apparently removed all misunderstandings, and we had received a charter which was accepted by all, but which now for some reason is being withdrawn.

Some days ago a consultative conference on teacher training completed its deliberations.²¹ I have no time to speak at length on this important issue, but the results of the consultation will be presented to you for approval. I have spoken of the kind of training that the teaching body receives at present. You know perfectly well that the num-

ber of teachers must be multiplied several times over, that we have to speak of several hundreds of thousands of teachers. We are at present sketching out a special type of training establishments for teachers. In these we shall have a profoundly humane school for young men who want to become pedagogues. If only we have enough of the kind of staff needed to give real knowledge to the thirsting body of teachers. Without such workers the whole programme would be an empty sound, for the school without the teachers is a definite, absolute zero.

I shall not speak on the work of the departments of the Commissariat for Education; I shall say only that everywhere much has been done. We have a schools section, which is working out the curriculum for the future school. Furthermore the Commissariat has been reinforced by the transference into its hands of *all* schools,²² so that they may be reformed in the spirit of working democracy, so that in the school as a whole all tendencies to turn a man into an instrument can be eradicated. Today there can be no place for this. Here one very serious question arises: can we limit ourselves to general education only? No, we also need technical education, which will make a man a useful member of society, not only a repository of universal knowledge. This can be started from a certain age upwards and can be done by education either within or outside the school, after a general education has already been acquired and general development prepared.

Our state has an interest in all becoming qualified workers, whom we need in our economic struggle, for we shall have to struggle still, not only with nature but with foreign competition as well. We need the country to be technically equipped. This is what dictates the plan for economic utilisation of people. But we are not going to take account only of what is dictated by our economic interests, but also of the need not to deform people. On this aspect we need to find the median geometric line that will satisfy both requirements.

This is particularly important for higher education: we are calling together a special conference at which we are going to talk with the representatives of higher schools in these terms. But we cannot wait until the school gives us citizens; we need adults too, who can build life without

waiting for the children to grow up. So we need to give thought not only to the development of children, but to that age-group which itself thirsts for development. From this point of view all Russia is a school, for each of us is a teacher, and if anyone knows anything he is in duty bound to pass that knowledge on to others. This is done through our extra-mural system, and here we are faced with a gigantic, urgent work, because the Russian people has opened its heart and its eyes, and lack of knowledge is a torment to the people, when it has to govern but is still living as if in darkness. For this reason we have to provide for this sector as well as we possibly can.

A Commissariat for Education of a socialist republic which failed to understand the full meaning of organising propaganda of the social ideas of revolutionary cooperation—such a Commissariat would be no more than a conglomeration of persons incapable of consistent thought. In this regard our extra-mural department is one of the front-line units on our educational front. Concerning the scientific department, we have to mobilise all our scientific forces. We do not grudge money, we are giving hundreds, thousands, millions for all manner of expeditions, scientific publications, laboratories, etc. We classify those who are scientists and teachers as “of the first category” among specialists, we give them more than we ought to give them. We ought to call a halt to our generosity, but we know that Russia has need of knowledge, and for this reason we court the scientific gentlemen. But they should accept our addresses not too coolly. Recently a newly-created technological-scientific apparatus has been attached to the Supreme Council for the National Economy, and this is mobilising forces for the technological needs of the state. Its Collegium is being appointed in consultation with us, and it is under the indirect control of our Commissariat.²³

As regards the arts department, I must be quite brief. The newly-created state machinery is trying to provide for the people to the best of its ability without wiping out anything of our old culture. We know that the proletariat will build a new culture, while studying the old. In this connection most worthy of admiration and regard are all those sections of the department which so heroically defended the palaces and museums from being plundered. All

excesses were put a stop to at once, and amid the greatest dangers and difficulties we nevertheless preserved everything. So that now the palaces of the tsars are made over to the public as museums, and people go there to admire or more precisely to wonder at all that was collected by the tsars. We are proud that we have returned and handed back all this to the people.

As regards the visual arts department, our current task at present is to clear the city of monuments which defile art. There are monuments which have no value either historical or artistic; we want to annihilate them. We do not consider that every tsar had the right to set up a brazen hulk on every square and then declare it to be a creation of Russian national culture. We are preparing to set up monuments ourselves. We want to make use of Lenin's idea—to use monuments as propaganda. We want to put up inscriptions everywhere proclaiming great thoughts and feelings, taking these from the great thinkers. We want to raise up our temples, where the representations of great men will be the icons. Our temple is dedicated to humanity, and we have our own teachers, from among whom we do not exclude apostles of this or of that persuasion, so long as they uttered truths that are eternal. Our temple is a pantheon of humanity, a bringing together of all that is valuable, all that is great, which has been created by people. We want cities to be not only market-places but temples too, so that you, as you go to work, can read thoughts that evoke noble feelings. Education through statues and pictures is the example of a great culture. Always, when democracy reached a great flowering—in Athens, in the northern towns of Germany—always it made use of this. All the grandeur of their culture, all the wonderful edifices which were built there had the purpose of attuning each soul to the common emotion.

Things are hard for us now, we have to go up to the neck in blood and filth, but after our Revolution, as after every great revolution, a wave of creative power will come and a new, beautiful, fragrant art will blossom. We are at present inviting the best artists, in competition one with another, to create monuments, maybe only temporary ones as yet, so that on the squares of our great cities and our towns the busts of great men may be raised up, and the

days of the unveiling of these monuments may be festivals of the people. At present everything here bears the nature of war, and our desire to create is also a factor in the fight.

Now, when we are opposing not German garrisons but the bourgeois system of the whole world, they are already pronouncing our names with respect in the West, they look on us as on cultured people who are building their future on the correctly understood foundations of education of the people. When the representatives of foreign states come to visit us, they see that in our hands is a new power, founded in the desire to raise up the people to the very highest peak of culture; they see that our strength is in our urge to create a new and a beautiful generation, and they are obliged to admit that we shall succeed.

What we have achieved in these ten months compels the world proletariat to believe in us. The proletarians in the West are profoundly grieved by our mistakes, they are rejoiced by our successes. There, in their own countries, they are saying, "In Russia we have got this or that; in Russia we are building a school of a new kind; another sort of people is growing up there." And the better we carry through our building of culture here, in our country, the quicker we shall gain for the whole world the beautiful future we are conquering for our children. Our Revolution will not remain fruitless. We came and took power not so that one fine day we might hand it back again, but so that we could build this beautiful new world. We must carry our banner high and bear it on to the end, placing our proletariat in the very front ranks of the world proletariat.

ON SOCIAL EDUCATION

Comrades and citizens, I have been invited here to speak about social education. At the very outset I must draw attention to the point that this concept can be interpreted in two ways, and both of these are of considerable interest. The first question that arises when we hear the words "social education" is this: *who* is to educate or bring up children—the family or society? since social education can be taken to mean education by society. The second interpretation of the expression has another bearing—for *whom* is a child to be educated, for itself or for society?

Both questions have a long history of their own, and a variety of answers, which of course vary over the range between these two poles. There have been supporters of family upbringing, who held that any limitation on the family as an educational institution, in favour of society, did harm to the education of new generations. There have been those who came out categorically in favour of a strictly social upbringing and conversely branded family upbringing as harmful, as something which fragmented the stream of humanity which is essentially one. In exactly the same way, the second question produces equally talented and equally convincing advocates of social education and individual education respectively. The object of my brief talk today is to give you some of the basic ideas bearing upon the history of this question, and upon that solution of it which we support or rather which we are now putting into practice.

You will often find, expressed by the noblest of people and the most profound of thinkers who have treated the question of culture, the proposition that probably the only truly cultured state, out of all states hitherto existing, was that of ancient Greece, a state distinguished by a quite surprising internal elegance or harmony. In the wondrous, harmonious architecture of ancient Greece we see, as it

were, the reflection of the clear, calm stability of that culture's spiritual and social way of life, and even in our times (starting from the Renaissance onwards), when people want to create a building of imposing size and expressive of calm and equilibrium, it is inevitably Greek examples that they turn to.

The Renaissance, and the Empire style which predominates in Petrograd—these are, essentially speaking, different refractions of the same architectural theme that was discovered by the Greeks, and this is no mere chance, because Greek buildings reflect their spiritual and social culture just as the Gothic style reflects the structure of the Middle Ages in both spiritual and social matters.

The Greek sculpture, still considered unsurpassed, whose fruits adorned those beautiful Greek buildings, was no chance achievement either. That sculpture expressed the classical ideal, and was used as an aid in Greek pedagogics. A cultured state can only be such insofar as it is a profoundly pedagogic one.

In order to construct a social system of such a kind that in it all the parts should accord with the common whole, of such a kind that in it harmony should rule (the word "harmony" was invented by the Greeks, to mean a correct inter-relation of forces, of any kind, including the cultural)—to achieve this it is necessary that all citizens should from their first entrance upon life be undergoing preparation to become appropriate elements of that whole. What is more, the cultured state can never remain static: it cultivates its powers, and each new generation must be better than its predecessor; at least society makes it its object to achieve progress in this respect, to see to it that the children, raised up on the shoulders of their fathers, should stand on a higher level of cultural development than their fathers. And those who have noted the immense importance which attached in that cultured Greek state to pedagogical matters, an importance admitted by all the statesmen, all the poets and the philosophers—those who have noted this have been quite right.

The word "music" (*musyka*), used to denote a definite pedagogical method, was in those days understood as the totality of information and certain technical skills which in sum ensured correct physical education, in the sense both

of normal bodily structure and of freedom and strength of its movements,¹ and on the basis of this beauty of physical culture there was then cultivated a no less beautiful spirit. The two words—"kalos" (καλός) and "agathos" (αγαθός) were joined together by the Greeks into the general terms "kalokagathia" (καλοκαγαθία), i.e. beauty of body and spirit. It was to this beauty of body and spirit that the democracy of Athens strove to raise its sons, all its free citizens without distinction of class (if we completely ignore the slaves, since the Greek culture did not consider a slave as a citizen and gave no education whatever to the children of slaves).

Why did the Greek state, more than any other culture, set itself this aim of education to harmony and beauty? Because little Greece, which had immense opportunities (it would be superfluous to dilate on these here) of developing its trade and its industry, its art and its science, was at the same time open to attack from the gigantic Oriental imperialist (to use a modern term) monarchies, which might at any moment have swallowed up that same little Greece. For such a small country to be able to defend itself militarily against these colossi, an immense enthusiasm on the part of every citizen was needed. And this was why it was necessary to produce such a citizen that one would be a match for a hundred others, a citizen whose specific weight would be truly enormous. This was what brought Greek state organisation to democracy, to a certain egalitarianism in the enjoyment of worldly goods, so that there would be none too poor to have an interest in defending his country.

If we look into how this astonishingly pedagogical country tackled the question of social education, we shall see that the Greeks regarded education as a necessary matter of state concern and deemed family education, not only for boys, but girls too, outdated.

In the age when Greece reached its finest flowering, care was taken to bring children together and entrust them to specialists—pedagogues. The word "pedagogue" (παη δγω γός) was invented and brought into use by the Greeks, meaning "a leader of children". These pedagogues also had in their charge large gymnasia,² where the children together practised various exercises—in gymnastics, dance, mu-

sic, history, etc.—these being part of the general system of civic education of that period.

There were of course different degrees of socialisation, in this respect Athens never carried things to the point of barracks-style communalisation of children. It was carried much further by the Spartans. The citizens of Sparta, where the aristocratic minority had not only to defend their borders against onslaught from the East but also to maintain their own hegemony, their overlordship over their own subjects, the enslaved inhabitants of the Peloponnese—these Spartans were obliged to live in a real besieged encampment. So instead of the Athenian semi-egalitarianism an almost socialist levelling-out of property was introduced, not in the country as a whole but as between the warrior-aristocrats. They even went as far as crude practices such as destroying children who were not born healthy enough. The education of men and women took on a predominantly military character. In Athens they never resorted to such extreme measures, it was a mercantile, sea-faring, broadly cultured state rather than a purely military settlement.

When the greatest of the Greek philosophers, Plato, describes the ideal state—taking as a basis the experience of Athens, i.e. a democracy of that age, and that of Sparta, an aristocratic society of the same period—he comes in the end to full realisation of the idea of social education. Plato, drawing theoretical conclusions from practice, says that no father or mother should have their children left with them. A child should be given over to society; it may be reared by its mother insofar as she is a good wet-nurse, but then it passes into the hands of the specialists, who develop it into a real man. This in his opinion is essential for those whom he considers as real people; craftsmen and workers he accounts half-people, and is not in the least interested in what becomes of their children.³

Now we may ask: how did the Greeks decide the question of for whom children were to be educated? (I have to tell you that very often individualists such as Wilhelm von Humboldt insist that Greek culture was an individualistic culture and put the individual in the foreground,⁴ but this is absolute nonsense). When the growth of trade in Greece in the IV-III centuries B.C. brought to the forefront mercantile and manufacturing strata of the popula-

tion, this was reflected in philosophy by Sophism, and you know how philosophers true to the spirit of the classical age looked on that sophistic decadence: they saw as monstrous the defence of the individual as an end in itself.

All the Greek tragedies, Greek theatres, Greek historians, lyric poets—they are all filled with the chorus principle, the desire to make the individual harmonise with one profound whole.

The citizen is in the forefront of attention as against the individual, but he must be a profoundly conscious, enlightened, flexible, richly endowed citizen, who can enter into conflict with giant states and emerge the victor. Here one must have citizens capable of dying for their native land. The highest value the Greeks know is patriotism, the ability to subordinate one's own individual tendencies, which the Greeks called pride, or arrogance, to subordinate them to restraint, to moderation, to the golden mean.

That is the ideal a man should set himself. Every Greek teaches: do not try to elevate yourself above others. When people become too eminent—never mind whether it may be a famous general or a famous statesman—he is driven out of the state, he is punished with ostracism, because such a large, overgrown individuality may be noxious to democracy.

So there can be no argument here. The development of individuality is essential insofar as, having said "we need the citizen" they then say "we need a strong, fine, skilful and intelligent citizen, but one in whom individuality does not become individualism".

Such is the classical ideal of pedagogy. We have become accustomed to calling all that relates to the Greeks "classical". When people say "a classical column" they are saying it is one made following a fine Greek example. From this point of view one might say that classical pedagogy is that which I have just spoken of. The continuation of these classical traditions will be the socialist answer to the question, i.e. development *through* society, development *for* society; but that society must be truly just. One cannot give children over into the hands of a society which is based on internal contradictions, which is incapable of standing up to intellectual criticism, which offends our conscience. If society is such that it calls itself a democ-

racy but in fact all the vital concerns of the country are controlled by a small group from a grasping bourgeoisie, then of course—regardless of whether that society relies on support from the church or not, whether it relies on the nobility or not—one cannot entrust children to it. This is a serious danger, for it will make of the children not what should be. It will undoubtedly make, in this respect, what are mistakes from the point of view of the ideal but no mistake from the point of view of its own interests.

The existence of masters and slaves poisoned classical culture too, of course. We let our attention be distracted from the slaves and have spoken only of the citizens, in order to get at classicism in a pure form—and this is artificial.

Today we are faced, in all countries, with the phenomenon of masters and slaves, of some people having no rights economically or culturally. Once that is so, then inevitably in the schools they will produce on the one hand masters, capable of dominating others brazenly and confidently, not questioning their right to do so, able to maintain themselves by tooth and claw in that dominant position; and on the other hand, slaves, i.e. obedient people . . .

And if we consider the history of pedagogics from this point of view, and setting in our sights in most detail the contemporary school, then we shall see that both our questions become strangely dualised and contradictory. If you open a book by one of the well-known authorities on pedagogics, Foerster⁵ for instance, you will see that they are protesting against the individualistic school. They say outright: the bourgeois school is no good to us.

We will leave aside for the moment the question of how they worked for the lower orders, but among the middle classes the schools developed individualism. The school said: we will give you knowledge and a diploma, we will arm people for their future careers and for the struggle for survival. And the whole spirit of the liberal-bourgeois school could be none other than this, because in it they taught, for ten years at a stretch: the state is like a night-watchman, let it keep out of our lives, let things pass you by, don't get involved, only preserve order. All things are created through competition, they assert from Adam Smith⁶ onwards; in struggle people create wealth and high for-

tune; any interference at once becomes an artificial factor, a poisonous interjection into the natural flow of events. The natural thing is to leave people to build their own and the general prosperity in struggle, to compete with one another, each separate individual striving to get rich.

But nowadays the new bourgeois pedagogics is up in arms against such a view of the school. The matter is, that the bourgeoisie in its economic development has come up against the need to fight for the last available markets. It has created a gigantic quantity of goods, and the world has become too small for it; alliances have had to be formed for mutual self-defence and for concerted attack on some other bourgeois group, and for sharing out the spoils in the manner most advantageous to those concerned . . . But once they have to get into fights "for an ideal"—the defence of the Homeland, to create gigantic armies for robbery and for sharing out its proceeds, then they have to evoke patriotism in a man, the readiness to die for one's country. Once you need that, you have to arouse the social feeling in him, you have to educate the citizen. And from this has come the idea of "civic education", which has become the ideal in German pedagogics, or what the French call "ethical" education. The whole trend is so to befool a man that he shall feel love and readiness to sacrifice himself, for a state which is visibly based on injustice.

Friedrich Foerster, having written lengthy volumes demonstrating the need to create patriotic schools, reaches the following conclusions: it is essential, he says, to preserve faith in God; if the Catholic faith should prove too feeble in this respect, then one can have recourse to another faith. The state as it exists is not such that people can love it just like that, unless you tell them that they are commanded to love it by some higher law. If, after all, one considers the state as it is, in real life, one is not going to love it, so one must bring in some additional interpretation such as God, heaven, hell etc., then maybe things will work out. So, one cannot devise real civic education without a mystical element. In Foerster it peeps out from every line that the mysticism means deception: if one tells the truth, the citizens are going to hate the state, so the truth must be prettified by the invention of supplementary lies. This is what it boils down to.

We only have the full right to speak of "civic education" when we can see that it is a harmonious society training its citizens, a society able to create a harmonious individual.

From the angle of the relation between the family and the state, one comes across some very interesting phenomena. Here progressive bourgeois pedagogues are coming out more and more definitely with the idea that social education is essential, because education in the family develops in the child a high estimation of his own personality, and a private citizen, a member of the population, who sets a high price on his own personality is not going to make a good soldier or civil servant, one who will serve the whole.

This trend is developing more and more strongly as time goes on, life itself impelling in this direction. The famous thinker Paul Natorp⁷ states that the family is disintegrating, among the workers and even among the peasantry, who are being drawn into the orbit of capitalist culture. The mother is ceasing to be present in the nursery and in the kitchen; she is going out to work—in an office, for a lawyer, as a shorthand-typist, a journalist, etc. So the little educational institution, the little kitchen, the little laundry—all that curse which has kept woman out of social life, all that is receding into the past. Now gigantic laundries, kitchens, etc. will be brought into being. So kindergartens also will be brought into being: the upbringing of the child will fall upon social organisations and the state. The state must catch the child as the mother releases him from her hands.

And then?—will it, the state, kill the individual in him? Yes, if it is a class state. That state requires iron discipline, and willingly undergone at that. Loyalty must be inculcated from early childhood. When this is the line being taken by Messrs. the pedagogues, we cannot be surprised when individualist pedagogues like Humboldt and Pestalozzi⁸ protest and cry wolf. This is indeed the anteroom to the barracks, the preparation of the sacrificial offering.

The individualist teaches that the school must produce only the harmonious personality and that in order to do so it must approach the understanding of human personality from the side of its inner laws, and all that is outside it

must be alien to the school. When a priest or a policeman approaches such a school, it must say to them: your place is not here, here the child is developing as his inner law bids him, something which no society can create.

But look and see what is this harmonious, developed personality in bourgeois society. You will see that it will either be crushed as under a tombstone by need and all the oppression of contemporary society which gives it no chance of clambering out of its slavery, or it will break its skull against the bars, but in any case it will accomplish nothing, if it belongs among the poor. And if we are talking about the harmonious development of a personality from a higher estate, then here Foerster & Co. are lying in wait, saying: do you know what sort of personality we have here? This is an egoist, who says he wants to eat well and sleep well, and for that he needs wealth. If Daddy has left him money then he should be grateful for that, but if there is no money then it has to be made. And the "harmonious personality" will spend half its life making money for itself, and later on, when it is already balding, will start clipping coupons and living as a parasite; this is a snob, a revolting person living only for himself—a useless person, from whom no one will ever get anything, because he is a hopeless egoist.

We, socialists, deal quite differently with the question of education. Only in socialism does pedagogy find its natural expression. The Greek ideal appears classical because in it is expressed the basic law of human being, but this law of human being could only live in Greece as a himeric dream. In a tiny state, placed in exceptional circumstances, it was furthermore being practised on the backs of slaves.

Socialism is the normal human society, its chief and basic principle lies in the simple concept of the community of all people for the good of all.

The point is, how to organise this in reality. It is a gigantic problem. But the main thing is clear: one must have not exploitation of man by man, but unification of forces for a common aim. Thus, a normal society must be constructed not for the good of the privileged, but for the good of all. Only from this time on does pedagogy become normalised, in hopeful prospect at least. Normal education is social education, therefore—from the point of view of the

aims of education—the contradiction between the individualist and the social side of education falls to the ground.

Indeed, socialism agrees with the supporters of civic education and says that one must develop the citizen in the man, one must develop a personality so that it can live in harmony with others, can achieve fellowship, can be socially linked with others in thought and sympathy.

But let no one reproach us that in so doing we may cripple the personality. If they ask us, "Will individualisation be permitted in our school?" we answer: "Of course."

If we were asked, "You want a well-concerted orchestra, you want to achieve maximum perfection in harmony—will virtuosi be allowed to play individual instruments?" of course the answer would be, "How could it be otherwise?" An orchestra presupposes a great multiplicity of sounds, it presupposes polyphony combined with unity, not such an allocation of parts that no one knows what he is at, one trying to drown the melody played by the other or to get another to follow and play his tune. Such an unnatural, crazy orchestra is bourgeois society. A natural orchestra is not everyone playing the same thing, it is a social grouping in which each player plays his own instrument. One person may work in art, another in science, a third in technology, etc. And, furthermore, each of them has access to everything: without being a musician a man may come to listen to music; being a musician he may interest himself in the conclusions of astronomy, know how clothing is made, and so on. He will not be a savage who looks at a passing tramcar "like a cow at a railway train" as the Germans say.

This unification of culture is what we are carrying through from the school, even from the kindergarten, onwards. We must not suppress any single talent. We cannot be prodigal when we need every single item. We must look and see in what direction a person's abilities lie most, and if he has ability in mathematics we must not compel him to learn Latin by rote, or make a person with a lively imagination study dull algebra or geometry.

The very greatest individualisation enters in as part of the real socialist school, but the more the child develops (and we see this in any school, in any kindergarten), the more important it becomes to teach him from the very

earliest age to respect another person's social nature, to find in games the way to spend time together, to get children to work together.

Things like a school theatre, looking after a school garden, or livestock, or library, or laboratory—all oblige children to work together. Will not each of them come to understand that he cannot be satisfied by one aspect of school only, cannot occupy himself only with himself and have no concern for others?

A play is also a process requiring cooperation. Everything in which the choral, harmonic principle works—all this is social education, all this draws the child into the complex but unified structure which a real society must be.

The aesthetes say that beauty is the unity of variety of form—so socialism is beauty; the socialist school is beauty, for in it maximum individualism blends naturally with maximum unity.

We do not need lies, we do not have to drag people into a service alien to them, but in agreement, in sympathy, in profound contact between fellow-pupils this society will grow up of itself, for it is a society of people freely cooperating one with another.

The state itself is necessary so long as the sword is necessary, so long as we have to defend ourselves, so long as there are people who would drown our socialist hopes in pools of blood and go back to the past. So long struggle is necessary, the state is necessary, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary. In these times of the dictatorship of the proletariat we cannot speak of normal conditions, but we struggle for normal conditions. There is no need for us to train this socialist fighting spirit into children; it will come of its own accord at a later stage. It is enough to educate to full enthusiasm and love for the free society, for human freedom, that of people who are also brothers and bound one to another. When the children grow a little older they will realise that between them and the ideal there stands a wall, blocking the path, and in their own time they will find within themselves the fighting spirit to break through and free the road to the ideal.

We ourselves, whose life is to some extent deadened compared to the coming generation, we ourselves will pass across this Red Sea by which we come out of the bourgeois

Egypt; our children must prepare themselves for life in the promised land, which waits for us on the far side of the Red Sea and which has been won by our hands.

It only remains for me to say what our point of view is as to who should educate—the family or the school.

It should be said that both points of view were set out in the clearest relief at the times of the French Revolution (this historical excursion does need to be made). Not that Condorcet⁹ in his lecture on education was a supporter of the family, no, society plays the greater part here. But he does none the less keep the child of an early age in the atmosphere of the family; the school is an adjunct to the family. He is afraid that the state may intrude into the school and deface it. The school is a centre, a place, to which one goes from the family, and then returns to the family. Exceedingly carefully does Condorcet guard these bounds against incursion by educators representing pedagogic communism. In this respect he is a true disciple of the age of Montaigne,¹⁰ etc.

Another great democrat, Lepeletier,¹¹ takes as his point of departure the idea that it is impermissible to leave the fate of children to chance; one child's mother is silly while another's is clever, for one the family may be a place of tenderness and loving care while for another it is one of severity. All this may in the future create a mass of moral cripples, spoilt pets, parasites, mummy's darlings, who will expect to be looked after forever. This is not to be tolerated; the state, like the sun, shines equally for all. According to Lepeletier, the state must take the education of children completely into its hands.

Let us look more closely at what the family is.

The family in bourgeois society was created only through the enslavement of woman. Schiller¹² expressed this excellently when he said that for a woman her home is the world, while for a man the world is his home. Family life was kept going by the woman giving herself to the kitchen and the nursery. The man came to his family to rest, and, as Bebel¹³ put it, to let the woman smooth the wrinkles from his brow. The man had work to do: if he was a soldier he was busy thinking of ways of killing, if a merchant—of ways of cheating.

The wife is busy taking care of her children: thanks to

this she develops the instincts of the broody hen, and she becomes completely indifferent to other people's children. If it should come to sharing a drop of milk with another's child, then the broody hen instinct turns into that of the tigress, and she will be ready to send other children to the next world. In this way a thing as sacred as the maternal instinct—the prime source of true altruism—is transformed into clotted philistinism, even with the best of mothers.

If a mother is poor she is overburdened with work, her nerves are on edge, she cuffs the children over the head. She loves them, of course, but at the same time she hates them; and the children run off to the street and there find their own "social academy", one not very beneficial for their minds or characters. If she is a lady, then she busies herself with charity, goes to balls and theatres, she has sufficient means to hire a pedagogue for her children—the notorious governess, who heartily hates children, who would like to be a lady herself but by the will of fate is obliged to be a governess and to bring up the children of the privileged class.

This is known as family life. Out of 100 women there are 99 who find themselves beyond the pale of the family. The more time goes on, the more there will be of these.

Can we set up such a state of things as the ideal? No, we cannot defend it. When the poor woman was summoned to work in the factory, the child was left without a family. When the middle-class woman was summoned to work in the office, the child was left without a mother. Then the woman's eyes began to be opened, and she saw that the world was not within the confines of her home.

We are not going to take anyone's children from them. Not a single mother will have to defend her children, weeping, as we drag them off to school. But an awful lot of them come to us, bringing their children, and say, weeping, "Take them, there's nothing I can do with them." There are very many such. We, socialists, have to think not of how to take children away from those who are trying to educate them in the family, but of how to provide for those who find themselves without a family.

In order to provide for them, we shall call in the woman who *knows how* to be a mother in the full sense of the word, who will not have to do the washing, go to the facto-

ry etc., who will earn her bit of bread specifically as a pedagogue. She will be near the children all the time, she will give them the affection they need, will feed them in body and in spirit. She will be trained for such work. She will not be Kolya's mother who hates Mitya, she will be a mother in general, whose maternal instinct is awakened by the sight of every child. These special pedagogical talents are there in women in abundance, they are met with often. In this field as in the fields of art, technology, science etc., we must have the specialist, in this case the woman specialist. Then we shall have a common reservoir for the young generation, then the halls of the palestra¹⁴ will be resurrected. But this cultured society will be one without slaves; the puffing and heaving will be done by machines, by motors.

Then we shall really be able to educate everyone for social living, for society, and this will mean, too, educating a harmoniously developed individual.

Such is the general ideal of social education, and from this follow definite methods of educating and of teaching. From this point of view we can take from the defenders of individualism the methods by which the particular gifts of a given personality are cultivated. And on this side we can also take from the partisans of civic education some methods of "choral" education.

The bourgeois school is tossed between the ideals of the individualist, through which peep the fangs of the beast, and the ideal of the disciplined man, also known as the slave, and it finds no way out. For us individualism and the social principle are joined in harmony. How much glowing light is shed on the education of the human race by the social ideal!

In spite of the devastation in Russia, in spite of the exhaustion we all feel as a result of the war and our revolutionary efforts, we can, with that lodestar to guide us, go on in a very short space of time, a surprisingly short one, from theory to practice, and demonstrate first by the single example, then more widely, and finally full-scale, a normal education, of which a normal pedagogue will say: now I can obey the dictates of my reason and my conscience.

WHAT IS EDUCATION? *

In this short speech I shall try to make clear to you the meaning which we attribute to the concept of extra-mural education...

First of all, what is *education* itself? It is not so simple to define this.

It used to be held here that a man who had been through gymnasium ** or, even more, through university, was an educated man. But one must approach this more critically. It is not at all true that anyone who has been through gymnasium or university is an educated man, and that by the same token anyone who has not been through a particular educational institution is an uneducated person...

Our word for education (*obrazovaniye*), like the German *Bildung*, comes from the word meaning *image* or *form* (*obraz*). It would seem that when our nation needed to define what every man ought to make of himself and what society ought to make of him, they had a mental picture of the image or form of a human being emerging from material of some sort. An educated man is a man in whom the human likeness predominates. You know how religious people used to say that man was created in the image and likeness of God, and that he had in him something of God. One of our greatest teachers, Ludwig Feuerbach,¹ who approached religious ideas from a scientific standpoint, very rightly remarked that it is not man who is created in the image of God, but God that is created in the image of man.

And how did that happen—the creation of God in the image of man?

If you look more closely at either the gods of Greece, who were dazzlingly beautiful, immortal, wise beings, or

*Abridged.—Ed.

***Gymnasium*—in Russia a secondary school, roughly the equivalent of the English Grammar or High School.—Tr.

at the definitions Christianity makes of its gods when it says that their gods or their God (the trinity, three in one) is all-beneficent, all-powerful, all-righteous, all-present—then you may think that man is not very like this, that man is far from being all-powerful or all-beneficent. The point is that the pagans in their gods and the Christians in their God were creating the *ideal* of man. When from the depths of his soul man dreamed of what he would like to be, he produced the ideal of the mighty hero or the god, who is a hero, only immortal, with the whole Universe at his service and all possibilities for development to the uttermost.

That is what man wanted to be. Man bears within him his own ideal.

Let us take, for example, the human body. The body carries its ideal within it. If you ask a physical training specialist what the normal human body ought to be like, he will *not* tell you to take a hundred people, measure their chest, heart etc., divide out to get average figures, and that will be your normal measurement. No, that is not what the expert in physical training will say. He will say a human body should be developed so that its muscles attain the maximum size possible without damage to the heart etc. He will want to show you each organ of the body given the maximum development possible without adverse effect on the other organs. That is, he will want to demonstrate *harmonious* maximum development of all organs of the human body: a healthy heart, healthy lungs, healthy stomach, healthy muscles, strong bones—everything in its place, everything prepared for movement, everything properly fed by the bloodstream. And you will at once get an impression of a beautiful being, a harmonious being, whom it is a pleasure to look at and who himself feels joy that he is alive. The physical education of a human being should bring its human material, misused by life, spoilt by heredity—our distorted modern human material—to development into such an image. Such is physical education.

Now let us put the same question in the field of intellectual education. When a man is asked what he would wish to be, he answers through his religion: I wish for omniscience, I want to know everything. But to know everything, given our brief human life, when we are far from winning

eternal life, is not possible. To fit the full volume of all the sciences into one head is an impossibility. What is more, all our contemporary culture is structured in such a way that one man takes certain duties upon himself, another takes others, and it is not possible at one and the same time to be an equally good doctor, painter, musician and technologist. It does not happen. Every good citizen in our society has his own speciality, in which he perfects himself, which he knows inside out, to which he is accustomed and in which, therefore, he works very well. So is the *man* educated *in general* to be lost? Is no omniscience ever to be given to man? Is it that one is to be an engineer, another an agronomist, a third maybe a tailor, and each will know only his own special trade, in the same way that it is not possible in our living body to unite the cells of the heart and the cells of the brain—for they are quite different, having different purposes and separate existences?

No, of course not. Human society is moving in the direction of division of labour. A genuinely humane, a proper society takes the path of division of labour in order to acquire the largest possible common capital both of material goods and of knowledge. But if no one was conscious of this *common* store of knowledge, of what medicine is achieving in its field, sociology, geography, astronomy in their fields, of what chemistry, mechanics, biology and pedagogics in fact represent; if everyone knew *only* his own work, and general conclusions from other fields of work were unknown to him—then our culture would fall apart.

An educated man is one who knows *all* this in general, in summary, but who also has his own speciality, where he knows his own business thoroughly, and who can say of the rest “nothing human is alien to me”. A man who knows the fundamentals and the conclusions in technology, and medicine, and law, and history, etc., is truly an educated man. He is truly moving towards the ideal of omniscience, but not in such a way that he only skims the surface of everything. He must have *his* speciality, *his* work, but at the same time he must be interested in everything and capable of entering an area of knowledge. Such a man hears the whole concert being performed around him; all the sounds are within his range, they all blend together into a single harmony, which we call culture. And at the

same time he himself is playing one instrument in it, he plays well and makes his valuable contribution to the common wealth, and this common wealth is all, as a whole, reflected in his consciousness, in his heart.

Such is an intellectually developed man, an *educated* man.

Now let us take artistic, aesthetic education. Just as I mentioned doctors and lawyers, so one must also speak of artists. If you have talent, you may become an artist—a specialist. But woe unto you if you as an artist say, "I don't understand music at all, I don't recognise its claims, my business is painting." And, equally, woe unto you if you say, "What business of mine is astronomy, I still believe the sun revolves around the earth."

No one should be an ignoramus. Everyone should know the fundamentals of all the sciences and all the arts. Whether you are a shoemaker or a professor of chemistry, if your soul is dead to any of the arts, you are severely handicapped, just as if you had only one eye or were deaf. For the education or formation of a man lies precisely in this, that everything in which humanity creates its history and its culture, everything reflected in those works which are useful to man, or console him, or simply give him delight in life—all this should be accessible to each man, but at the same time he should have some speciality. Not necessarily just one only—there are some people of such great talent that they can have two: for instance, one of our major composers, Borodin,² was also a scientist, a chemist. Such things do happen, and they can only cause humanity to rejoice. But in no case should specialisation kill general education, or general education kill a man's specialisation, for in the latter case one gets dilettantism, one of the most offensive phenomena.

The dilettante, the man who does everything for pleasure, who plucks the flowers and skims off the cream, should not exist. It is vitally important that in some one field a man should himself be a creator, that in it he should immerse himself in work, stretching his individual powers and creating with his heart's blood and his brain's sap inventions of real importance to humanity. If a man has not this within him, if he is only a dilettante, he cannot be called an educated man.

We will now pass on to ethics, to morality. Even when we were speaking of the intellectual, technical and artistic development of a man, we might have asked ourselves "Wait, you say that all humanity should be at the service of each man, that everything produced in the mines, the fields, the gardens, in the mills and factories, in artists' studios and workshops of all kinds, in theatres and academies, in universities and laboratories—that all this should be accessible to each man, that each of us should roll up his sleeves and work in his own place for, say, eight hours, and then go to the temple of human culture and there delight in the work not of his own hands only, but of those of all society. But does this happen in the bourgeois world?" No, the vast majority of the so-called "common people", which bears the main burden of labour, is completely cut off from this culture, is absolutely unable to make use of it.

Furthermore we see that almost everywhere specialisation has been carried so far that it disfigures the image of man. They have gone so completely into their special fields that even in a comparatively progressive country like Germany the specialisation cripples the real man. And at the same time there is a mass of parasites eating the bread of idleness, who distort the image of man in that they only enjoy themselves, they create nothing, which causes the creative power of their spirit to atrophy. They are like the parasites which gradually lose both legs and wings and become nothing but a bag of an insect nourished by another organism. This is the greatest disfigurement, and however it may be adorned with brilliant artistic refinements, it still remains disfigurement, ugliness. It infects the whole of life. And for this reason over practically the whole face of our contemporary culture we do not see a truly educated man.

When man drew his ideal in respect of ethics in the image of God, he said that God was all-beneficent, that he was bounteously loving, that in his love he comprehended all men. All men? No, that one cannot say...

When the gospel says "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father in heaven is perfect", listen to what that father in heaven says: "Vengeance is mine, I will repay". His perfection is not impaired because he is going to sit in

judgement on men on the judgement day, and send unrepentant sinners to a torment such as human power cannot summon up—eternal fire. So, God in man's imagination is a being of great love and of great wrath. Love can triumph in its final form only when there shall be no more objects for wrath, when there shall be no ugliness and no malice. But until then, so long as they do exist, they are to be exterminated. So one day man in his triumph, when he shall have to struggle no more, will perhaps be an image of pure rejoicing—"The countenance with triumph gleams".³ But until victory comes, until then we must send our shafts whining into the target—the monster that would break apart our culture. Until then man must be a fighter. What for? For the image of man, for its forming, for the education that forms it.

And the revolution, the socialist revolution, is a revolution in education, both in and out of school. This revolution is a revolution in the formation, the education of man, a revolution of great love not only towards those who today are disfigured and deformed and so uneducated, but towards our sons and grandsons, whom we love because in them we find that man we should like to have been, but that we ourselves, unfortunately, cannot be. This absence of realising oneself as a fine human being turns into a terrible yearning for the ideal, and into wrath against whatever stands in the way of humanity on its way to the ideal. From this point of view the revolution is the revolt of man, who forms or educates himself not in separate individualities but in the whole of society, for one cannot give a man an ethical education if a real society has not been created.

Only in a proper society, in which each person in truth works not in order that someone else should make use of his labour, but in order to make his contribution to the common capital, to the common temple in which he himself lives and he himself prays to the great and the beautiful—only in such a society is a truly educated man possible, only there can he open his heart, and cease to say with Maupassant that man is always alone and even his best friend is an enigma to him.⁴ Such mistrust of one to another has been sown in men's hearts by the fault of social conditions, of private property; it must be melted, hearts must join with other hearts in an atmosphere of brother-

hood, an atmosphere of love and mutual help. And for the very sake of that love a man must feel a burning indignation every time he meets with the monster, injustice; it must be swept from the face of the earth.

So it is clear what the aims of education should be. It should strive to create out of a man deformed by today's society a person of physical beauty, able to perform absolutely all that is dictated by the presence of those organs which now we see repressed, not developed. He must develop all his organs harmoniously, so that they should not hinder one another. And society as a whole must also develop all its organs in such a way that they should not hinder one another. Just as in the organism of an educated man every cell lives and functions for the good of all, and everything blends together in the sensation of happiness, so in society everything must serve the common cause, and each separate individual must exert his maximum creative efforts so that all should blend together in one harmony.

And this harmony of all, which we call culture, is education. The schools must serve this education. But how can they do this? Can they give a man an education such as this, in all its fullness? No, this cannot be attained in any term of years, the process of such an education goes with a man from the cradle to the grave. As long as a man lives, he is still learning. And there is no period at which he ought not to be learning. Life itself is so constructed that one has to learn, not only because every art and every science is continually progressing, but also because the life around us sets us new tasks every month, obliges us to accommodate ourselves to something new. A famous Japanese artist said that only at the age of seventy did he at last understand what draftsmanship really was, only at seventy did he feel himself to be a real artist. And this incidentally was a true, a great artist, who had done a great deal of fine work before then, but at the age of seventy he performed literally miracles with the brush and had performed to be acknowledged practically the greatest draftsman who ever lived.⁵

Not only has one to learn all the time, one must at the same time be constantly alert, flexible, one must be open to new impressions. How terrible, if by education one means that at twenty-two years of age a man is set once

and for all in a final mould. No, he must continually accommodate himself to the new, he must respond to every new sound, be capable of catching each new shade, each new discovery.

You know that there are old people of such a type that, however much one may show them that is new and fine, they will still say, "No, in our day things were better, everything in our day was better, it was another race of people then. No stuff of heroes ye." In fact this is of course nothing very terrible, just a clinging to the forms of life of the time when a man was himself formed.

It is a great art to be a child, but life itself teaches us this art. Almost everyone is capable of being a child, just don't hinder his child's joy. Do not hinder, do not destroy this capacity—one of the marks of genius—to rejoice in life. Later, when we pass on to youth, then to maturity and then to old age, the great art of life is the most important art of all. Yes, it is one of the great arts—to be a fine old man. And it is perhaps in this that humanity finds a fuller expression than anywhere else—in the wise elder whose heart is open to all that is new, who welcomes the new generation, who passes his experience on to it, who can say that his life has indeed been lived by the light of love. And then that life comes to its calm and majestic setting, when a man full of days, not troubling himself about life beyond the grave, dies in the knowledge that what he has done is now given over into the hands of future generations...

All this has to be learned. A man has barely accustomed himself to seeing himself as young, when another time is already upon him, and if he cannot meet face to face that which for some others means misfortunes and horror, he will go down. We must learn always. So, education is not a matter of school only. The school gives only the keys to education. The school must teach a man to work, it must lay a foundation of certain definite methods of approaching all the mystery represented by the world, it must in this way give the first push, and after that life will roll further on, and no one can say in advance what a man's path will prove to be.

Extra-mural education is the whole of life! All his life a man should be educating himself, because the ideal is

distant and there should be no moment spent quite without gains. If there is one, that is a moment he has stolen from his own life. Of course sleep is necessary, rest is necessary. But the sleep and the rest are necessary only in the proportion that will enable him afterwards, having gained new strength, to catch up on the time lost. There is a saying "He who sleeps sins not". No, the man who sleeps too much sins terribly, he is losing time, killing time; and he who kills time is killing himself, killing the image of man in himself, killing society and killing the very ideal of true humanity. When one or another group of clerks gets together and says, "Let's play a few rubbers of whist, to kill the time" they are describing their occupation absolutely accurately: they are four murderers, engaged in killing one another and killing socially useful time. Their life is so shallow and impoverished that only here, at the green table, can some customs clerk or register-keeper feel that there is some chance of a bit of luck coming his way, of his being in on a "big deal"—that is a great event for him, he has no other events in his life.

A man who seeks to educate himself should not kill time. For him all events, every insignificant happening raises a question, and to find the answer he has to dig into books, ask questions, and then take in fully what he has discovered. And what does "taking in" mean? To make something part of him, make it an element in his own riches. A man's real wealth is that which he has taken in, made his own.

There are amateurs who have their own picture gallery, their own theatres. But they have *taken in* none of this, and so the owner of these things is not they, but the penniless artist who will come to the gallery and be able to admire with full understanding this or that picture. He is a thousand times more its owner than the one who paid a thousand roubles but did nothing to take in the picture, to make it a source of his own joy.

The school gives opportunities for making things one's own.

And what is out-of-school, extra-mural education, for what have you been gathered here? You are gathered here so that you can teach, and learn, out of school. Extra-mural education is the business of creating, and utilising, centres

of culture which can help a man to make his life not a mere passing of the time, not a simple process. This is the essence, this is the aim of what is called extra-mural education: museums, libraries, theatres, people's universities, courses, gymnastics clubs, etc. Make all this accessible to the population, draw the population into all this, so that they can learn, and teach how learning should be done, so that they can give their soul, all that they have which is of value, into the common treasury.

Here in Russia this work acquires an especially keen significance. It is one thing to say, "Life is a sea of everyday living, one must be able to swim and to make one's way to the distant, promised shores of better living." It is another matter to say, "People are drowning, we must learn to swim in order to save them." Here in Russia there have been no real schools, no one has been through a real school. Our schools disable people, tear them apart from one another, give portions of information which is then forgotten. And how many people there are who walk about with closed eyes and do not know that they are blind, that they have only to open their eyes and they will see the sky, the sun and the earth! For us extra-mural education is a gigantic apparatus for propagating a number of educational, i.e. scientific and artistic values, a gigantic apparatus for the cultural enlightenment of the people that has been kept in dark basements, that has been kept in mole-borrows under ground, that has been given no chance to spread its wings—in order that the people should be able to make full use of its won victory.

Politically it has triumphed already, economically it is beginning to take all the centres of production into its powerful hand. But how will it govern, how will it run its economy, if it has no knowledge? It will gain knowledge in the schools, but "the snail is on its way, it will get there sometime". We must give knowledge now, and not to the rising generation only, from whom we shall, let us hope, make men of a new kind, but to the very people who have just won the victory. Give them the opportunity to change society, give them knowledge!

The physical hunger we feel now is much less dangerous than the spiritual hunger, than the malnutrition of the people in the cultural sense. How many mistakes the people

is making, how many evil men it is advancing, men who disgrace the workers' and peasants' cause by their disgusting trickeries! But what is the people to do when it has not got knowledge, when it is obliged to snatch at all those who come forward? What is it to do, when its state power was in the early days sabotaged by the intelligentsia out of political prejudice? Mistakes are being made at every step, but the people has faith in itself, it has the sincere and firm conviction that it *has to* triumph, it has the sense of thirst for knowledge, all the more so since it has brought down the building of the old culture, is living among the ruins and laying the foundation of a new building.

In order to know what to demolish and how to demolish, in order to lay the foundations of the new building correctly, a mass of knowledge is needed. And we fear lest the people-in-blindness, although it has realised its own strength and has become the master politically, may prove unable to get rid in the economic order of the evil inherited from its tsars and its gentry. That is why this matter arises so very urgently here and now.

And your business is to carry out all that is normally carried out by the school, i.e. to give simple literacy, but at the same time never to forget that the ideal is not in this, nor in pulling a man through to master this trade or that, but in making him a fighter for the humanity of man. And a man can only become that when he knows what the world is, how it came to be what it is, how the present juncture arose from the capitalist system, what relation to this is borne by our scientific, artistic and economic tasks, and what place I, Ivan or Stepan, have in this world, and what I am to do. Give him the ability to do what he ought to do, in the period of the greatest revolution the world has ever seen!

That is why, comrades, our worker-peasant government cannot but attribute the very foremost, colossal significance to extra-mural education. That is why no resources can possibly be sufficient for this, and that is why the workers' and peasants' government will spare nothing to help the cause of out-of-school education.

If we had a sufficient number of teachers, we could even now cover the whole of Russia with people's universities.⁶ But this is not so easy to do, because the number of people

capable of acting as bearers of light in this way is not great. We must first train lecturers, train those who will be the leaders, and this must be the top priority job, it would seem, that we have to get down to. In the meantime we must be satisfied with the little that we can do for the masses straight away.

None the less I must say that while extra-mural education is a mighty lever raising up the masses of the people to a new level, it is a no less mighty lever for transforming those who consider themselves educated. We will make educated people work in this field, even those who do not themselves want to do it; we will draw in those who do come halfway to meet us, so that they can use their education to serve the people. The crumbs of knowledge **they** have they must give to the people, and in giving them they will not become poorer, on the contrary, they will become richer.

Working with adults is not the same as working in school. Although even in the school we demand that the teacher be a co-worker with the pupil, there we are after all dealing with an immature pupil and a mature teacher; here we have a man who has been cut off from labour, who has known no real hardships, who has no social instinct, no revolutionary sweep of a creative soul—he will quite simply be a learner from the workers and the peasants to whom he comes, whom he starts to teach. Yes, in teaching he will have to learn! He, coming to them, must with hands trembling with happiness pass on to this hero-people what he knows about physics, chemistry and so on. And he must know that the thanks we will receive from the people, in simple cooperation, will give him new strength. The Russian intellectual drags out a repressed and pitiful existence. If he can, from being a lackey of autocracy, which moulded him as a future overseer of slaves, become truly a citizen and imbue himself with that which fills the best among the working folk, only by working together with these working people will he be able to become a true citizen.

Making use of this, we shall be able to tie together in one knot the huge chain of the people, which, filled with the sufferings of the past, is forcing its way forward to the future, with the tiny chain of science and art, which bear so much of value in them and which must pour their com-

paratively small streams into this troubled and dark river. The confluence will bring good, for this troubled and dark but mighty river is the medium which can give the chance to develop and to shine to all the good in contemporary culture that there indeed is, for who can deny that there is a vast deal of immense value in the science and the art of the past. From contact with the people all this will burn up with a new light, will turn from a dead thing into a live one. All this will catch alight with the flame of real creativity and will at the same time light up the inner depths of the gigantic but so far still dark soul of the people, a soul dark but burning, dark but rich.

We call upon those who know to give their knowledge to the unknowing and to become infected with the power of the labouring people. From the union of the two there will gradually be started the creation of the educated man, the titanic fighter who will bend all his powers to transforming the face of the earth, then of the man-god, the being for whom, perhaps, the world was created, who will be the king of the natural world, but a king such as we dream of when we say: an educated man.

Our ideal is the image of man, of man like a god, in relation to whom we are all raw material only, merely ingots waiting to be given shape, yet living ingots that bear their own ideal within themselves.

And at the present time—a molten time, a feverish time, a revolutionary time, which has the power to make an immense leap forward—it is we who have to go, all together, in concert, to whatever level we may belong in degree of education—all together towards this shining future. Under such an order of things as this the starting up of any courses, in which the workers' and peasants' government, that is the bearer of the burning faith and thirst for knowledge with which the Russian people overflows and which that government is trying to arouse in you also—the starting of such courses is a great event.

Comrades, during these recent days when Soviet power is beginning to win victories, when the nightmare sense that at any minute we can lose our footing, that at any minute the sword of internal plotters or the monster of external hostility may stop the breath of the infant child that socialism still is, lying now in its huge all-Russia cradle—now

that that is to some extent past, when our chests can take a breath of good cheer, when we see how imperialism is everywhere crumbling, starting with Bulgaria,⁷ when we feel that the time is not far distant when our victory will be more or less complete, when we are being joined by thousands upon millions of our brothers who until now have lagged behind us—during these days, travelling about Petersburg, making speeches at the opening of courses of all kinds and clubs of all kinds, I feel a happiness that overflows my breast, when I see so many people ready to work, and not only at the bottom level, but among the intelligent-sia too, from whose ranks many are coming to us with great readiness, asking only, "Is what we know of any use? Take it if it is of help." And they bring us their valuables, things of great price, whose existence the man who was, in the old terms, an educated man, sometimes did not even suspect, and which they now place at our service.

Russia, following in the footsteps of her very own red Petersburg, is full of the vastest spiritual potential. We have a vast potential at our disposal in our work of building anew, and given this potential the fear melts away that we are very ignorant, very young, very immature, that we are the youngest brother in the European family, a young brother who has set himself to solve a problem which seems beyond the powers even of the elder brother. We need patience, but not the patience that delays—the patience that bends all its powers to the accomplishment of the task, that does not despair when the whole structure is not raised up at once. It does not follow from this that we can work with no great sense of urgency. All into energy, all into the greatest possible exertion of effort—and we shall create the new man!

The eyes of the whole world are upon us. Some have watched us and said with secret, malicious joy, "Look, now they stagger, now they are down—now they are up again!" Now they see that we are putting firm roots down into the ground, that we are about to celebrate our proletarian anniversary, and if there are as yet no golden fruit on the young tree, there are already the first small leaves, the first buds have already appeared. One among these buds, one future blossom on the tree, is your courses, which, comrades, I greet on behalf of the Commissariat for People's Education.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The business of education in a class state, as we have frequently written, always bears the imprint of class.

Let us leave aside for the time being the spheres of what is called "objective knowledge", the data of the exact sciences, although even here we may mention that the aroma of class manages to creep in the most pervasive manner even into what might seem the most inaccessible corners of science, up to and including mathematics.

But if we concentrate our attention on the humanities, we find that here those thinkers who are known for greatest precision of method have in fact recently been establishing the existence of huge doses of subjectivity.

A study of the methods consciously and unconsciously used by, for instance, historians, leads one to the conclusion that the personal equation plays a major role here,¹ and that even the most objective piece of historical research is, in the last resort, a quite original bringing together of materials, from which other historians may, with equal conscientiousness and scientific justification, deduce the opposite conclusions.

Over and above the involuntary class bias which is imparted in this way to the fruits of scholarly labours, and therefore to teaching based on them, we have before us also the more or less crude forms of direct falsification of a given science to suit these or those class prejudices or to serve these or those class interests.

Education, as a sphere of state activities, has from this point of view always been an instrument for adjusting the psychology of the masses to suit the intentions of this or that class government. It goes without saying that the overall educational policy of a class government would appear refracted in various ways in various strata of the social environment.

The teaching given had different aims in view as regards the education of the ruling classes, of the middle groups

(the groups of what one may call overseers), and of the lower orders, who were for the state merely an object to be worked on, and a source of labour power.

We are not denying for a moment that the socialist system also, in the first stage of its development, i.e. in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a society of classes. It definitely has a politically ruling class, to wit. the proletariat, and furthermore it must essentially be admitted that this class finds itself in a state of bitter struggle to maintain its dominance and under the constant threat of the wheel of history being turned back. Under these conditions education can in no way be viewed as other than an important weapon of class struggle in the hands of the proletariat.

The whole difference between the rule of force by the bourgeois state and the state of proletarian dictatorship lies in the fact that the efforts of the former are directed towards strengthening and establishing for all time the state itself, and with it the enslavement of some people by others, while the efforts of the latter are in the direction of suicide, so to speak, that is, towards the creation of conditions under which the state itself will cease to be necessary, and towards the full liberation of every human personality. But the means used, the way taken, is nevertheless force.

These are reflected in the field of education in that education and the whole state apparatus of education must be utilised for the purposes of communist propaganda; force may come into this in the sense that persons forming part of the state educational mechanism who do damage to the business of communist propaganda, or who refuse to be at least its passive transmitters, must be relentlessly expelled from the state machinery.

This apparatus must at the same time be filled, so far as is possible, by elements capable of serving as active transmitters of communist propaganda.

In accord with the vital difference between the state as a form of force used by the bourgeoisie, and the state as a form of force used by the proletariat, we see here also the efforts exerted by the bourgeoisie to impose through the school (just as through the press, etc.) their bourgeois falsehood.

And the communist dictatorship, not flinching from the use of force, does its best to spread to the maximum the truth which is the proletariat's and at the same time belongs to all humanity.

The tendentiousness of the bourgeois state is repulsive, just as the sword of the bourgeois state is an accursed weapon of anti-humanity.

The urgent propagation of communist knowledge is also tendentious, but the tendency is a noble one, wholly serving the interests of the development of the human race, just as the communist sword is in the transitional period an entirely chivalrous weapon, defending the oppressed against the oppressors.

Up to the present time there has in our practice been no conjunction—not only no conjunction, I would say not so much as any simple *rapprochement*—between communist propaganda and the educational system.

For a communist, what kind of educational system can exist outside of communist propaganda? Have we, propagandists of communism, ever concerned ourselves with anything other than the education of the people? Is not revolutionary propaganda the most genuine education of the people, in the most essential field, that which touches the people most nearly?

Whenever the question arises of the Commissariat for People's Education having the duty to act as an instrument of communist education, as a powerful body for the propagation of communist ideas among the entire population of Soviet Russia, then objections are at once raised from two sides.

What the supporters of "pure" and "objective" education say is, "What! You want to subordinate the sciences to the line of a particular party! You want to sacrifice the schooling of the population to the effect of mass-meeting appeals by agitational orators?", etc. etc.

To these objections we reply: no one is trespassing to the slightest degree either upon freedom of scientific investigation, or upon the widest possible—ideally much wider, infinitely wider than anything that has existed up to now—the widest possible education of the people through objective knowledge: knowledge of the language, of mathematics, of the natural sciences, of the arts, of technical skills, etc.

This general school education can with us proceed quite freely precisely because the proletariat and its ideal have not the least fear of the light of truth. Lassalle long ago pointed out this natural affinity between science and the "fourth estate".²

But we know that the schools are bound, firstly, to present to children and young people the past of the human race, to give a picture of the present and to illumine hopes for the future, and that to do this with absolute objectivity is something no one on earth can achieve, for this absolute objectivity is a thing hidden from the eyes of men.

We know that under the guise of objectivity people are trying to present history to children and young people from an outmoded point of view, from the point of view of the outmoded classes (the landlords, the bourgeoisie) or of intermediate between-classes groups, from the point of view of various petty "intellectual" ideals.

As to their being scientific or objective in nature, these are of course mere potsherds compared to the basalt solidity of a scientific socialist approach to the history of culture.

While demanding for reasons of proletarian tactics that teaching both in and out of school should be inspired with the spirit of scientific socialism, we might equally well, and with hand on heart, demand the same for reasons of the highest scientific objectivity.

There is actually no science or technique which would be quite unrelated to the idea of communism or to the building of Communism.

On the contrary, all knowledge, be it the most remote from social issues, such as knowledge of the laws of nature, and every technical skill likewise, is illuminated with new light when we look at the natural world as a staircase of laws in the increasingly conscious self-construction of a rational, happy collective embracing all humanity, and when we can view all work as a part fitting harmoniously into the ever more rational plans of social and cultural construction.

So the rationalising objections made by the partisans of independence of the school need not trouble us in the slightest degree, the school will be independent of the sad past of humanity, and as objective as possible, and as scientific as possible, if it becomes as communist as possible.

But we meet with objections, unfortunately, from the opposite side also—from some comrades, themselves communists, including and in particular some individual propagandists of our party.

They are afraid that if the Commissariat for People's Education is recognised as the ruling body for propagating the communist truth, then the current of purely party propaganda will flow into the broad stream of general education, and that burning questions of the day—politics, tactics, teaching the programme etc.—will be watered down and lost in the shoreless expanse of general education.

I have even met with objections that formulated this idea with greater naiveté: some comrades have with serious faces assured me that one must not take the business of propaganda away from party people and entrust it to high school teachers.

It goes without saying that it would be monstrous to allow even for a single minute such a thinning down with other elements of our party propaganda; the point is not in weakening it, but in strengthening it.

The party propagandists, both personally and in the very same organisational associations which now exist for them, remain as before, and they are subject to no new control, only to that of the Central Committee. Their link with the local party branches remains absolutely inviolable, and they now have at their service the entire apparatus of the Commissariat for Education. They can establish themselves with in it, they can make use of our schools, people's universities, social centres for common people, libraries, theatres, concerts, exhibitions, etc.

It is not a matter of subordinating the Party to the Commissariat for Education (and taking that to include the teachers and scientific workers who are its direct employees, and who are in their vast majority very far removed from communism); it is a matter of just the reverse, of subordinating that apparatus and that staff to the Party, as directly as possible.

I repeat, the work at present being carried out cannot suffer any damage, for no changes are being made in the business of party propaganda by its being brought closer to the work of the Commissariat; but a very essential change is being made in the work of the latter, inasmuch as it,

striving to convert itself into an instrument for spreading communist science and scientific communism, cannot perform this task without the most especial help of the Communist Party.

Thus the idea which I should like to see discussed and grasped by our party propagandists is *not* that party propaganda should be part of the Commissariat for People's Education, but that the work of the Commissariat for People's Education should be a part, and a very, very important part, of the work of the Communist Party.

THE TASKS OF EXTRA-MURAL EDUCATION IN SOVIET RUSSIA *

Comrades! The phenomenon of education is, essentially, the main pivot of rational being for every human individual that deserves to live, and for the whole conscious life of human society. If the old proverb says that man does not live to eat, but eats in order to live, one cannot by any means say that a man is educated in order to live and does not live in order to be educated. He lives exclusively in order to be educated, to educate himself. Each minute of life and each action in life which does not strengthen our spirit, which does not widen the channel of our life, is a gift lost.

Through a long succession of millennia men got their education in dependence on cosmic and elemental causes and were led, as it were, by nature. Driven by need and by nature at one stage of development, one group after another then emerges into the band of sunlight, the light of self-understanding and self-knowledge, and then sets itself a goal—its own spiritual development, a conscious, ultimate goal of its own. And when we hear the words “extra-mural education”, we are seized with involuntary fear at the sweep of the tasks it sets.

Certainly the main part, the main segment of work in the education of a human being falls on his youth, and it may be that skills of living acquired and work done when a child is of pre-school age are of boundless importance. We all attribute immense importance to pre-school education (which was the theme of the congress¹ which took place a few days before this of ours), but pre-school education does none the less have elements of primitive simplicity. Acquaintance with life, art, technology and the past of humanity is gained after school has been started, and happy are those countries where every citizen finds all of this in school, under the guidance of a freely acting and highly

*Abridged.—*Ed.*

qualified teacher. But even in these countries, which are hypothetical rather than actually existing, school learning can never achieve perfection. Through all his life, even though grey locks may cover his head, a man can, will and must go on receiving education, and thus all education received outside of school, since all life cannot be fitted into a school framework, is in fact the process of extra-mural education.

It would however be paradoxical and absurd to take the tasks facing the Commissariat for Education, or this congress on extra-mural education, in as wide a sense as this. By extra-mural education in its technical sense one must understand the help which the state and the school give in the matter of education to people who have been left without help in this aspect, that is, those to whom the school gave too little, and those who did not go to school. To help them to go further, to fill in and even up the education of those who in school failed to acquire enough knowledge or who received an education disabling the soul rather than assisting its growth—such is the object of extra-mural education.

Although we have thus narrowed down the task of extra-mural education, we still have a boundless expanse before us. In Russia especially, where there is an enormous number of illiterate people, workers in extra-mural education are faced with a huge task—to ensure the right and the duty of every person to be literate. This problem must concern all of us in every way and to full capacity. This is the daily bread of extra-mural education in Russia!

It is pleasanter, of course, to get carried away by matters like people's theatre, to sketch in the prospects of wonderful social centres, but this is something not to be dreamed of merely, but worked for. First of all one must descend to the basement floor of extra-mural education and remember that the basic, hard, mass work is precisely the struggle against illiteracy, against the most crude and primeval ignorance.

We can never, of course, limit ourselves by dividing off the road before us with mile-posts, as it were—saying that in this stage we simply have to make the people literate. It need hardly be said that literacy is a functional concept, which under our very hands develops into a concept involv-

ing ability, power. What use is a literate person who reads no books? This would be someone condemned to relapse back into illiteracy. And we know that the number of people in Russia who learned to read and then forgot again is monstrously great; and not only in Russia, even in more developed countries one meets a similar phenomenon.

Literacy is a key. And you have given a man nothing if you have given him only a key but not the chest or treasure-box it will open, and similarly, literacy is not a value in itself although without it other values are almost unattainable. We must start from the same point that the school does, i.e. one must think not of mere literacy, but of giving the whole adult population, *accommodating ourselves to all levels of its spiritual development*, the general-educational food which it vitally needs. In speaking of accommodating ourselves to different levels, I mean that all kinds of courses, Sunday schools, evening courses, continuation schools, separate lectures, etc.—all must be calculated to provide mental food for beginners who have no scientific concepts, no basic training, and likewise for those at a higher level educationally, perhaps right up to meeting the needs of the best educated. Here, in Russia we must not reduce culture to primitive terms and make the further development of educated people impossible.

We can raise up the masses only if scientific and cultural work at the top level continues. In order to carry on extra-mural education we need extra-mural teachers, and in order that they should be able themselves to learn, we need extra-mural professors.

We need a living culture of the highest order. The social organism must develop evenly, from the lower levels of culture to the higher.

The popularisation of scientific knowledge, the popularisation of the arts, social and political propaganda—such are the basic tasks of extra-mural education.

Very frequently a school-teacher takes up extra-mural work. He has the same attitude to an illiterate adult as to a young pupil. But a worker or a peasant can sometimes stand higher than the teacher, in experience of life. For this reason one must not, in teaching adults, use the usual methods practised in school. Teaching an adult to read is a process that must take place in an atmosphere of general

extension of knowledge, must be based on reading books, newspapers, decrees.

The same link with life, with working experience, must remain in the case of popularisation of scientific knowledge. Here it is desirable to reduce actual lecturing to a minimum, replacing it with practical work in the laboratory, the factory etc.

But can one say that lectures are not needed at all, that they are mere school-work? No, of course not. The living word of the lecturer is of immense importance, especially here in Russia, but so far as possible a lecturer should always and everywhere use visual aids, the magic lantern, films—in a word, draw the extra-mural student by every available means into the process of operative, active perception of knowledge.

But to what extent can the actual content of scientific information contribute to the communist enlightenment of the masses?

The natural sciences are the least debatable. The very foundations of their view of the world have to be more or less objective, owing to the very nature of the capitalist order. How can you expect either conscious or unconscious falsification of a science dealing with plants, animals, laws of mechanics etc., if the economy cannot be carried on given a falsification of truths of this kind? Inasmuch as the economy has to be run, that machines have to function properly, that ailing stock has to be treated, that the earth has to be fertilised, so far objective knowledge is required. For this reason this area of knowledge is in every country profoundly honourable. Its job is to question nature, using the least wasteful and the most deeply probing methods, and to formulate as precisely and economically as possible all that nature dictates. We have therefore a considerable number of scientists, both those of the very highest category and, descending the scale, popularisers of grater or lesser degrees of talent, or at the very least well-informed lecturers, to whom we can without fear entrust the whole business of teaching the natural sciences, all the way from cosmography to the smallest details of applied techniques.

Things are quite different in the field of the social sciences. Here everything is debatable in the highest degree. For according to how a man looks at history, what he un-

derstands as his ideal, what he sees as the most significant factor in his present life—on all this depends which direction the man will take, what he will do, how he will work. Society until now was based on social inequality. Particular classes were successively dominant to a greater or lesser degree in various countries. After the feudal lords, the capitalist bourgeoisie became dominant everywhere. This capitalist bourgeoisie was compelled to falsify science at all costs—and all the more consciously, one may think, as time went on.

For as time went on there appeared before the bourgeoisie an increasingly dreaded foe, which it had itself brought into being—the proletariat, which saw the past, present and future of humanity in quite another outline, having quite different criteria by which to assess it. And when bourgeois science had to enter upon a life or death struggle with the young proletarian science, that struggle was not confined to the matter of ideals, the facts themselves were falsified and altered to suit the ruling class—even statistics, the language of “impartial” figures.

I am not saying that bourgeois science as a whole, or all official university science, was worthless in the area of the social sciences, I do not wish to say anything of the kind! And Marx, when he counterposed bourgeois scientists such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo to one such as Thomas Malthus, said that Ricardo and Smith operated under the pressure of the phenomena surrounding them and perfectly honestly took these into account; it was only as representatives of a particular class and a particular time that they could not reach the *full* truth, since their eyes were turned in another direction and so did not see it. But Malthus, said Marx, *consciously* distorted science; by his life and his writings he showed himself to be a conscious *apologist* of the bourgeois class.²

Of course both kinds of elements are represented in science. So far as consciously falsified science is concerned, it is the less harmful, it dies naturally as soon as criticism touches it. So far as involuntary falsification is concerned, here the matter is more complex. And when we, representatives of the young proletarian science, talk to various hoary-headed professors sitting on their twelve or fifteen volumes of Collected Works, they are convinced that they are

uttering exceptionally objective, exceptionally significant thoughts when they say: "Science is objective", "Science is free". And when we Marxists speak of class consciousness, the proletarian world outlook, the proletarian scientific movement, they assert that this is a narrowly class approach or even a purely party one.

Where we see white, they see black. They think that the social science which they took in with their mother's milk, likewise from the lectures of their professors, who for them were great authorities, that that science is "objective". While from our point of view it is from the very root upwards infected with a thousand prejudices born of bourgeois government, which distorts the essence of social processes and puts them in a false light. Here the disagreements between them and us are so serious that one cannot help asking the question: "What are we to do about the major part of the educational army at our disposal for extra-mural work?"...

We must turn our attention to the most concentrated work of both the lecture/seminar type and the teacher-training college type, in order to get the great yeast of social science, based on scientific socialism, multiplying and making the dough of education rise both in and out of school.

Without energetic work being done in this direction we shall continue to hear all the time, from our comrades in the localities and even from those in Petrograd and Moscow, declarations like this: "Now we have a syllabus written, an excellent syllabus, with the object of raising the level of social knowledge among the masses. The reading of courses on it should be entrusted to people who are at least definite socialists, but there aren't any. And we have to entrust work on the syllabus to people who are hostile to it, who will say 'No' at all points where it should be 'Yes'. And then the syllabus is turned into its own opposite."

And often there is no way out of this situation. I have remarked on this difficulty. It is a difficulty which the Commissariat for Education has to wrestle with continually. And we get people saying to us from one side, "Think nothing of it. The lecturer will teach something or the other, and the masses—our own people—will sort it out for themselves; if they should drink a 'cup of cold poison' it won't actually kill them!" And on the other side we have others saying, "What

have we got being taught here? This is straight counter-revolution!"

So what do we do? Close down most of the schools, most of the institutions of the extra-mural system? Destroy the framework of cultural work, and leave it to grow up from below, like the grass in springtime? This too, of course, is an absolute absurdity, and it is clear that there has to be a golden mean.

There must be a certain amount of sifting out, a certain amount of cheking, and the most energetic work possible on producing social science teachers of a new type. I know that many people intentionally or involuntarily are adjusting themselves to suit the new times: intentionally when they get careful about propagating those truths which are not quite the thing at the present time and instead emphasise those elements which are new; and involuntarily when they are really carried away by the sight of the working class in struggle, which they have in progress before their eyes. And before our eyes we have many people being re-born, some suddenly, as Saul was changed into Paul, some slowly and gradually, but emerging as new people. And this process will gather momentum as time goes on, for teachers, the army of those who give instruction, are recruited in the main from the intelligentsia and not from the bourgeoisie.

While the intelligentsia, being for decades under pressure from tsarism and capital, did sometimes without realising it turn untrue to itself, it is now quite natural that the firmer the new system becomes, the faster—rising in an ever greater wave—will the intelligentsia flow towards us—the new master of the world, who will free it from its imagined "objectivity", who will liberate the intelligentsia for real, genuine free creativity... So there is no need for us to let our heads droop too much. These difficulties are temporary, and the methods I am speaking of—selecting the most suitable elements, laying greater stress on factual knowledge rather than interpretation in those cases when the latter cannot be entrusted to someone who is far removed in spirit from the new Russia, and at the same time working most energetically on the training of appropriate staff—these methods will relieve us of these difficulties.

Concerning popularisation of the arts, this is a matter

which may at first sight seem a luxury, and people very often think that extra-mural education has to deal with art, maybe, in order to "instruct while entertaining", as the Latin tag has it. This is an entirely ridiculous view of the tasks facing extra-mural education on the arts side.

I will not touch upon abstruse theories of art of one kind and another, about which one might talk for a very long time. I shall dwell on the more or less generally accepted fact that dominates all theories of art: art is a force which affects the feelings of the mass of hearers or spectators, evoking particular sentiments expressed by the artist. This is undoubtedly true. One speaks of the art of speech only insofar as the orator is being not only propagatory (i.e. extending the area of his hearers' knowledge) but also agitational (i.e. moving their feelings)... A man's character changes when he is carried away, when he is fired, when he loves, when the chords of his emotional, feeling essence are touched. And this is what art does! And all peoples, even at the dawn of their existence, have recourse to all manner of social dances and songs.

Art organises human hearts in the mass as science organises heads, and yields as its direct result a moral uplifting of the masses. But for this to be so, the art must not be of the corrupting kind to which the bourgeoisie has resorted in the most recent period of its existence...

At the same time, in the art of the past very many groups of the intelligentsia have rebelled in the most active possible manner against the bourgeois spirit. Throughout the course of history they have constantly sought to create an artistic consciousness for themselves, a religious-artistic art.

In the epochs of highest development of any given human group we find great art, even in the past, art which can serve as a source of every conceivable inspiration and joy for us. And on the basis of this art, of these great treasures we have inherited from the past, we can foster an art which corresponds to our great times, especially seeing that it was at the time of the great French Revolution that the foundations of a new, mass art were laid. Half the nineteenth century lived by that art. In music, the French Revolution produced Beethoven, in architecture—the Empire style, which is the greatest style that modern Europe has created,

and from the literary works of the Revolution flowed two mighty streams—Romanticism and Realism.

The time of that revolution, which many considered "prosaic", and saw in its actual art only tendentiousness, in fact gave a giant push forward to creativity. The people's festivals which Paris saw in its time are now being carried on here, in red Petrograd and in Moscow, at a higher level of the movement than that achieved by the French Revolution.

In just the same way we see in the field of science also a whole series of the greatest possible changes, evoked by the Revolution or accompanying it.

Thus we are inclined to think that art has a direct connection with all work on the education of the soul of society. For the word *education* has, after all, a three-fold meaning. On the one hand, that of a man forming himself, i.e. bringing himself closer to the form or image he has set as his ideal. On the other hand, such an educated man, who has been turned from a human semi-finished product, a human "ingot" or "pig", into something approaching that majestic concept of Man, who has perhaps not yet been born, whom we want to bring to birth—this educated man as an individual unit cannot exist without the appropriate conditions being provided. He needs an appropriate atmosphere, a society of people who are not just an agglomeration, a plenary meeting of educated persons, but a new organised society, a super-organism in the full sense of the word, in which resides a great, social soul. This is socialism, this is communism, this is what we counterpose to the society that is just an accumulation of people. Here individualism and social sense blend together. The business of education is not only that of educating a person, a personality, but the business of forming the human race, forming society.

Lastly, man forms not only himself and his social environment, but his physical environment also. He not only clothes himself, creates tools, buildings, cities etc., but also extends his parks and orchards around those cities; changes the course of rivers; alters the outline of the sea-coast, making bays or isthmuses where there were none before, and in this way he creates a life that meets all the spiritual demands of this man who has created himself.

From this point of view, work on self-education, work of a social and political nature, and aesthetic work—all these are channels of education, all these make their way towards the image, the prototype, which we picture to ourselves and call the ideal.

Proceeding from this, one must say a few words about two further tasks which we cannot neglect.

We cannot neglect *technical* extra-mural education. One must not dream about the education of the individual, one cannot think of attaining social ideals of whatever kind, if society is sitting on a branch that has gone rotten. We shall fall down and break our heads, be we ever so excellent ambassadors and leaders. Our Red Army can be victorious on all fronts, our political leaders can amaze the whole world with their foreign policy, but we can none the less suffer disaster in our revolution, if we have no railways and no bread and produce nothing.

Here in Russia, this depends to a large extent on general causes, on the destruction wrought by war, on economic backwardness, but besides this, of course, we also have in all respects insufficiently trained workers—this is what chiefly holds things up. We have people who are insufficiently trained technically, insufficiently trained in point of actual labour discipline, insufficiently trained in point of moral comprehension of the tasks before us. All these aspects merge into one unbroken whole.

We cannot address ourselves to the economic tasks if we have not got workers who know how to work. We have few skilled workers, a derisory number of engineers, still fewer middle-rank technical personnel, in general a very small number of people trained for anything. We have to increase that quantity by all available means, and to improve quality also.

At the present time we see urban culture seeping away in the countryside. Perhaps this is a process that will bring salvation in the current situation; perhaps thanks to this tens and hundreds of thousands of working-class people have taken root in the villages; perhaps this will create the groundwork which will enable us to build a real bulwark of Soviet ideals in the countryside; perhaps thanks to this the load will be taken off the cities, which in these grim days cannot feed themselves. But if we tip over on to the far

side of the watershed and turn into a typical agrarian republic, then however much we may talk about communism and socialism there will be no communism and no socialism: the laws of social development will produce instead the growth of a rural bourgeoisie. . .

For both political and economic reasons we need technical education.

Very shortly the Commissariat for Education will publish a declaration stressing that the unified labour school could not and was not intended to damage technical education proper, that the unified labour school on the contrary is itself a technical school and aims to transform itself into a polytechnical school. In this declaration there will be directives to workers in the localities to the effect that the labour school must not cause closures of special technical schools. And a corresponding note must be sounded all the time in extra-mural education too. The tasks of extra-mural technical education must in no way be neglected.

I know what difficulties await us in this matter, but I also know what immense prospects we have before us. If we could march firmly forward along the road we have indicated, there is no doubt that extra-mural technical education could turn those who want to acquire technical skills into cooperative groups in various trades which, working in the factories, would bring their experience to bear, would raise the labour potential of the work-force in general and so raise the level of production. They could act as a powerful motive force in raising the country's production. I can only dwell briefly on this aspect. At this congress there will be a special report made by people with a deep knowledge of this side of extra-mural education and up-to-date information on the economic tasks facing Soviet Russia, and you will then receive fuller elucidation of this question.

We should make mention also of physical education. I will not expand too much on this, because this theme has been generally well dealt with and is familiar to all. It cannot be dealt with in detail in an introductory speech such as mine. It is absolutely clear that through physical education too we can achieve a higher level of consciousness among the masses, in fostering proper care for health, which is the foundation of all life. By developing strength, skill and beauty, and bringing them together in group activities

in such a way that this becomes an element in social life, the appropriate results have been achieved even in some bourgeois countries (Germany, for instance). Their associations (Vereine) for sports and for gymnastics have attained a high level of physical culture, and at the same time some of these associations have become continuing cells of working-class organisation and have been used as such in case of need. Physical education should be a collective activity, not an individualising one, and in this field very considerable achievements are possible here.

If we recapitulate that we must fight illiteracy, popularise scientific knowledge, make people acquainted with the arts and help to bring forward those capable of creative work in them, and take due care of technical and of physical education—then you see what an immeasurable field of work opens out before you. And meanwhile we must not fail to recognise that all this needs to be shot through with the red thread of political propaganda. . .

By this present time Marxism has already essayed in such depth the retelling of the whole history of humanity, the re-investigation of all the foundations of the societies that surround us, and has achieved such enormous results that we can say: there is no branch of knowledge, no field of science that cannot be taught in such a way as to form a part of the edifice of a socialist world outlook. We can open up the road thither starting from any science. We can enter the innermost recesses of the social structure starting from any science. . .

I could take any example, any science, any scientific problem, and demonstrate that nothing is easier than to link it up with the basic stream of social propaganda. And conversely, there is no political problem or theme for a meeting which cannot be treated scientifically, to demonstrate which you could not quote a number of facts from various branches of knowledge. This is what we should aim to do.

We should aim, whatever knowledge it may be a man is acquiring, to tell him what it is for. In order that he may work better, he needs to know that he is working to build up the country's economy. He must know that he is a true citizen of a new world of labour, just now awakening and uniting. Every piece of information should be so presented

that it becomes, as it were, a tool in the listener's hands, for the further propagation of scientific principles.

I could say the same thing about art. Of course everyone understands that a lecture is a work of art when it is well given, that that art is not merely a matter of the lecture having many figurative images and being delivered in an ardent tone, but of how it is put. This is the art of construction, and in this sense teaching is one of the greatest arts, by which the teacher, the extra-mural lecturer, works upon the noblest material of all—human spirits. And one must know how to form them, first softening them, making them responsive to your touch, to your action upon their noble side.

This can be done only when you have won a certain influence over people, when between them and you currents have been set up inspiring in them a certain sympathy towards you. And that means you have appeared before them as an artist.

If you use singing and music, as we often do at our public meetings, if the painter's art wings its way to us of itself, as it already alights on our banners and our posters, if the whole flower-garden of the arts blossoms to help you, then that is how it should be. And you do not have to wait for your listeners to feel the need of it themselves, you can call in all the nine muses to help you in your work.

There is no activity, from an amateur theatrical group to painting murals on the walls of a club, which cannot be utilised to further the development of people's taste, to make them sense a fresh wave of delight in life, to speak to them with the voice of art, which is particularly easy to comprehend, of the great truths which are the sun of heaven to us.

Comrades! I should very much like to have the opportunity of expounding these ideas to you, bringing them together in the shape of the People's Social Centre which is after all the basis and the ideal of extra-mural work. Extra-mural work can of course go on in self-education groups, workers' and peasants' clubs, courses of all kinds, through libraries, through theatres, but all these forms of activity are brought together and take on an organic, integrated shape in the concept of the People's Social Centre. This concept is even wider than that of a centre of out-of-school

education. The Social Centre should be seen as not only a cultural and educational centre, but also a centre of political, trade union and cooperative life.

But this idea of the "integral" People's Social Centre I should like to present to you in more detail if I make a report specifically on this during the Congress, and if I do not do that, at least make some additional remarks on this to complement the articles I have already written, which it may be possible to publish as a separate pamphlet. Just now I think it is more important to indicate some features of the structure of extra-mural education, of its existing apparatus.

There is no doubt that the point hinted at by Comrade N. K. Krupskaya in her speech is of unquestionably great importance in the building-up of extra-mural education.³

If we are to understand extra-mural education in the sense which I have been expounding, then clearly it has to have contact with a number of other departments of the Commissariat. It would, however, be incorrect and paradoxical if we were to say: since the theatres, libraries, museums, galleries, exhibitions, and cinema—all this, and even books themselves, are all educational media, and media of extra-mural education at that, then all this ought to be dealt with by the extra-mural department.

Of course, if you went to a theatre and did not come out of it a better educated person than when you went in, that theatre should be closed, for it is not theatre but light entertainment. You get there the same kind of recreation as if you had a sleep, and only from that point of view does it have some faint right to exist. The theatre is a means of education. And all social life is a process of education for each individual, but this is the business of the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom), not of the education department.

We will outline the limits of our task quite definitely. The extra-mural department's business is to come to the aid of those among the population who cannot acquire education purely by their own efforts, who need help to be given through extra-mural educational establishments, i.e. schools of a sort, of a slightly different nature from the usual, but none the less educational establishments. Since this is so,

our theatre section can look for direct help in education from the theatres.

But the theatres exist independently, they have artistic responsibilities to discharge too, they are building up a wide artistic repertoire and attempting to achieve the greatest effects possible to the art of the stage. Come along to the theatres and learn, if you want, but they will not come to you! But if you want to arrange a special performance preceded by a lecture, then that is the business of the extra-mural department. For that purpose the extra-mural department can come to an agreement with a provincial city theatre, or with the Maly Theatre, saying: give us a performance which will illustrate, say, this or that moment in the history of mankind, or even five or six plays which will illustrate successive epochs—that is the proper business of the extra-mural departments staff, but for the rest one must leave the theatre free to develop according to the laws of its artistic advance.

Man must open up his creativity in both arts and sciences as widely as may be, for on this tree grow the fruits that later must nourish all. And in art we must not reduce everything without fail to the popular level. We must take thought in order to raise up as many people as possible, by the means of popular entertainment, to artistic creativity, to the ability to work in the world of science, to absolutely free creative work. Of course the state cannot simply turn the department of theatre into a sub-section of the department of extra-mural education, but it would be sad if from this another false conclusion came to be drawn; then in that case the department of extra-mural education has nothing to do here, let the department of theatre make its own arrangements for amateur theatrical groups or theatres presenting simplified productions, let it work out what is an appropriate repertoire and recommend it to the theatres, let it worry about popular exhibitions accompanied by lectures, etc.

A conclusion of this sort would be extremely inappropriate. The single structure of extra-mural education would then be fragmented. Who then would be in charge of the People's Social Centre, in which there will be theatre, and exhibitions, and concerts, where each function will proceed intersecting with other departments? Of course this would

mean that our business of extra-mural education would be disorganised. This would be especially obvious in the case of library work. A library is an arm of extra-mural education. At the same time the library department has the task of extending libraries of all types: it would mean that half of its work would be taken away from the extra-mural department.

One can solve this problem in another way. Let there be departments dealing with libraries, with cinema—fine, but we will set up our own little theatre section, our own little cinema section, our own little library section, which will be just for us, for extra-mural education people. If that little section does not have concentrated within it the best artistic and scientific forces we have, if all the main bodies dealing with the arts are not brought within it, the result will be very small beer, a sort of cottage industry within the extra-mural department. And that department will cease to have the ability to use all the resources of the state.

The only way out, therefore, which I would recommend the Congress to consider carefully, is that each of the departments related to ours should have a sub-section within it developed more or less specifically for dealing with the extra-mural educational aspect of their task—to put at the service of the masses, in popular form, that particular art or science which in the given case is the main concern of that department, and that each such sub-section should come within the extra-mural education sector as its auxiliary body. It is quite essential that the Congress should think about this organisational centre, because in the localities, in the guberniyas, something of the sort may be repeated, perhaps in truncated form, and approximately the same solution should be applied there...

Of course the introductory speech I have made cannot deal with all the issues with which this ten-day congress has to deal, and on which, however great its capacity for work, it will not be able to say the last word either. I should like to think that in this introduction I have at least partially achieved what I set out to do, that is to remind you of the vast scope and importance of the work being done in education outside the schools, and to note at least its central problems. These I have looked at in the light of that

fine, red moment of world history which we are now living through.

We, gathered together here one thousand strong, must not let our heads drop and say: this is not the time to hold a congress on extra-mural education, when the advance of our foes threatens on every side, when Soviet Russia is defending itself against all these unleashed dogs of war with an arm unweakened, it is true, but none the less wearied in the fight.

No, this is grand, this is symbolic, this shows the might of our movement, that at the present time, when we are calling people into battle, to the fronts, to repel these shameless onslaughts, we are at the same time bringing hundreds of people together here, in the centre, in the heart of Russia, to discuss questions of educating the people. For of course the sword in one hand and the torch in the other—that is essential for us now. Both the one and the other is for us an equally important condition of victory. Thus we here are also holding a council of war, we here are also in the same great battle.

And as the representative of the Red Army has already said here—it is serving us, and we are serving it. All this together, comrades, is so vital now for the whole of the world's history: our service is one of majesty, for the fate of all mankind.

ON THE CLASS SCHOOL

The Bourgeois and the Communist Labour School

In a class society everything that the state does has a strictly class character.

There are two dominant opinions on the state: that put forward by the liberal bourgeoisie, and that held by Marxists.

The liberal bourgeoisie asserts that the state is the organisation of order. While not denying that separate classes exist in present-day society, and that they may fight against one another, the liberals say that the state and its laws stand above classes and have the duty to see that these classes do not, in the course of the strife between them, destroy the general unity. It guards justice, and at the same time sees to communications, hospitals, schools—those sides of life, in short, which are essential to everyone and which therefore come under the charge of the common body, the highest body of a social character—the state.

The liberals consequently demand that the state itself should depend upon parliament, elections to which are free, so that each class may send its own representatives there. In this way parliament is in their opinion a reflection of the relations between forces within the country.

This theory of the state as a compromise, as a contract wedding together the differing classes in a society, gets some reinforcement under a democratic parliamentary regime. Yet this theory is quite incorrect. In fact the reality does not fit into it. In fact the state, as many suspected before Marx, and as Marx quite definitely and precisely demonstrated, is the organisation of the government of the ruling class, and no more.

The ruling class is a minority exploiting the majority, living on the labour of the majority, and having to control land, equipment, stock, and its own workers. It can exert this control only by creating a vast machinery of force, and all states in the world have armed forces and police forces

which are at the service of the ruling class, and which put a stop to any attempt on the part of the majority to reach out to the huge property in the hands of the minority, employing the cruellest reprisals to herd the majority back into obedience.

It was so in the slave-owning state, where the slave-owner was armed and the slaves were not, where the slave-owner had men of his household ready at his command to overpower the slaves should they dare to rebel. And it is so in the most refined democracies, where the labour movement's protests against exploitation evoke judicial reprisals or outright punitive expeditions, even in Britain, even in America, even in Switzerland. (Not long ago the Swiss police shot down workers in the streets of Zurich.)

The principal object of every state is to ensure the domination of the ruling class. But as the majority starts to acquire education and organisation, when there is a proletariat already thinking in political terms and a petty bourgeoisie indulging in radicalism (that happens where the big bourgeoisie is either close to power or has already taken power into its hands, where there are good communications, where there is a certain level of capitalist development), then the big bourgeoisie finds itself unable to establish an order of things whereby power belongs to it without conditions and without disguise. It has tried to do this by operating the so-called property-qualification form of government, which only admitted rich people to parliament. But this was difficult, this was obvious to mature democratic sections (even among those who owned property), which became restive; there was even fear of revolution. So for these reasons there has been introduced by the bourgeoisie (sometimes quite voluntarily) the ingenious machinery of universal suffrage, which appears to give political equality to all citizens, but at the same time ensures that power remains with the rich.

In America, Britain and France universal suffrage exists; these are the democratic countries (democracy means "the power of the people"), but the vast majority of the people there live a beggarly life, while an insignificant minority owns the factories, mills, mines, houses, properties of vast extent, and lives in imposing luxury. And these are the models of the democratic state. And if there should appear

people who say that the machines, and the buildings, and the land should all belong to the people, and only then will there be people's power, those people are seized and put in prison, their newspapers are closed down—in a word, such teachings are met with cruel repression.

This cannot be achieved by force alone. Of course, the bourgeoisie can be better armed than the workers, but at this stage of development the bourgeoisie is obliged to maintain very large armed forces. Both to deal with the country, which is large, with the large numbers of people in revolt, and likewise to defend itself against the attacks of other predatory states, a large standing army is needed. So on the military side the bourgeoisie has to rely on universal conscription.

But an army of the people might easily join the rebels. The point is that never, at any time, has the state relied on crude force *alone*. The *principal* means of suppressing the lower orders has been *the sword*, crude force, but alongside this have gone *methods of poisoning the consciousness* of the lower orders of society.

Firstly, one must not give the lower orders knowledge, the masses must remain ignorant; secondly, on the basis of that ignorance one must inculcate in them such views, such a state of mind, that the slave should consider the existing situation quite right, that he should see it as a proper order of things; one must pervert his common sense and make him voluntarily submit to the conditions under which he lives.

Our own writers have depicted a character—the serf or household servant who waits on his master's pleasure like a dog, waits on him hand and foot, who is convinced that God bids him lay down his life for his master. Remember how the soldier used to be convinced that to lay down his life for the tsar was a feat of heroism. You see how people have been tamed, brought to hand! They were brought to hand so successfully that they became slaves to the marrow and blessed their slavery. This was done with the aid of religious perversion, through the priests. From childhood upwards, sometimes, they began to fill the heads of subordinates with the idea that this world is not the real world, there is another world beyond the grave, in which everything is different, and which one must know about in

order to know how to behave here. Religion most cleverly teaches that the world is so ordered that here the poor man drags out a miserable existence, but so that he may in the next world receive his great reward, while if, on the contrary, he should to any extent rebel against fate here, he will suffer terrible torments in the next world.

These ideas have been knocked into the skulls of the peasantry, along with a mass of other prejudices, and thus the peasants, the lower orders, became permeated with this idea.

There is a great monarch in the world, against whom one can do nothing—God, to whom good harvest and bad, the fates of men, life and death, sickness, success and failure—everything, is obedient: all depends on him. He is not your mere earthly tsar, who can put you in prison: on Him depends a man's fate not only while he lives, but the fate of his eternal soul. And what is man's short life on earth compared to that eternal soul? And this great tsar has established the existing order on earth.

Christianity says that it is the poor man whom God loves, that He is on his side. Nobody knows, maybe the rich man will really catch it in the next world, one just has to withstand this brief temptation and obey the rich man in this world. This doctrine is advantageous, of course, to the rich man, and the poor man in his ignorance believes, and supports the whole ingenious device. Even in Western Europe we see the same thing: we see vast sums of money being spent by the state (or, where state is separated from church, by "society") to maintain this army of poisoners, darkeners of human understanding, the priests of all sorts.

And the more cultured a country is, the more refined and ingenious Christianity becomes, to remain a sufficiently effective narcotic.

At the stage of development of the more or less civilised state it receives into its hands enormous resources for the poisoning of human consciousness, it gets the national barracks. Universal conscription means that every young man finds himself for a time in the iron grip of the military machinery. In fact two or three years' military service for everyone is not necessary. War experience has shown that in three months at the most one can produce a good fighting man.

But the young man went to be a soldier for a long time, so that the officer caste and the NCOs can rob him of all will of his own, so that he will be prepared to shoot at anyone when they order him to do so. Under the guise of "patriotic" duty men are turned into dummies, trained to perform tricks, and a man thus trained carries in his soul, not only for the duration of his life as a soldier, but in after-life too, the submissiveness, the faculty of being hypnotised by the word of command.

Then, the state gets the press, i.e. the ability to disseminate on vast quantities of paper (either as itself, the state, or through the organs of the press which it buys over or maintains) any slander you please, to write whatever you please, to carry on a lie campaign against socialism, to put out a web of gossip, rumour, false news. A whole river of lies runs through the veins of the press, especially in the countries of the West. It penetrates everywhere, literally into practically every peasant's hut, and there does its devastating work. The mercenary newspapers create what is called public opinion. This public opinion, which seeps through into the very midst of the masses of the people, is in the literal sense of the word fabricated. The state says: kindly prepare public opinion thus and thus—and all the papers start to buzz, to a given line; they are believed. Then they have to fight the "alien" press, the socialist press. In democratic republics one cannot just close down socialist newspapers, but even without that the fight against them is comparatively easy. To run a big newspaper you need big money. The workers do not have this, the workers' newspapers are published on a shoestring. Then, the bourgeois banks and firms do not give them their advertisements, and in order to sell a paper for one sou, as used to be done in France, you must have advertisements, otherwise the papers cannot exist. For this reason the socialist press has in many cases been just a poor relation of the bourgeois press.

Lastly the bourgeois state had yet one more resource—*buying up and bringing over to its side leaders of the oppressed people and the working class.*

From among the workers themselves men are often elected to parliament, men numbered among those who understand this whole mechanism, who start to preach to the masses that they should open their eyes, should look and

see that this is not democracy at all, that it is deception all along the line, that with the aid of barracks and press, and bribery, they are being governed by an insignificant minority that makes their lot in life miserable.

To begin with, such men were simply wiped out by all available means, but later that became impossible, there were too many of them.

As under a parliamentary regime these men get elected, if they are eloquent speakers, to town councils or the wider councils corresponding to our former *zemstvo* of the gubernia, or in the end to parliament, it is found convenient to buy them off. Such a man is promised all kind of good things, accepted into the club; some of them marry bourgeois girls, suddenly get appointed to high posts, are sold or get given shares in companies. Some workers' representatives give way to these temptations and sell themselves. Some sell themselves completely, body and soul, like a Briand,¹ becoming utter lackeys of the bourgeoisie, but still preserving a thin veneer of socialism as camouflage. They mouth all sorts of revolutionary phrases, but put the revolution off a few hundred years into the future, and warn the workers not, God forbid, to follow those who frivolously want to implement socialism now. They become *evolutionary socialists*. They are made ministers. They are able men, and the bourgeoisie entrusts its entire fate to them, makes them the chief helmsmen of the ship of state, because they, veiling themselves in a fog of socialist phraseology, are of more use as politicians than an ordinary bourgeois whose wolfish fangs are too obvious to the people.

They did the same thing here in Russia. As soon as the bourgeoisie attained power in February-April (1917.—*Ed.*) it demanded that socialists should be made ministers. It summoned up Chernov, Tsereteli etc.² It set them up as a screen, and they travelled around putting out the fires of revolution like real masters of the hose-pipe. They served as a blind in every way, while real power was in the hands of the capitalist Konovalov, the landowner Lvov, the banker Tereshchenko.³ We did not have men to whom the bourgeoisie could simply entrust all power, but in Western Europe there are some men risen from the people, like Lloyd George and Millerand,⁴ who become prime ministers and presidents. Of course they are kept on a short leash.

There are some who only sell themselves partially. Their circumstances become more or less comfortable, they stop hurrying, but in words they remain, apparently, entirely socialist. They go about all the time, they carry on agitation among the workers, they set up organisations, but in reality it is all by arrangement with the bourgeoisie. They say that the goal, i.e. revolution, is nothing, but the way to it, i.e. reforms, are everything. Today working time was cut by half an hour, tomorrow there will be ten kopeks on the wage-rate. This is the reality of "parliamentary struggle". Softly, softly, take it gently. The bourgeoisie is happy to make such concessions. And a huge party such as the German Social-Democrats, up to and including the most left-wing people, like Kautsky,⁵ finds itself completely bogged down in this parliamentary silt. Thus does the working class lose its leaders.

You see what immense powers the bourgeoisie has, but far from the least important among these is *the school*, which the bourgeoisie also turns into a tool for perverting the consciousness of the masses.

The first task a government of the ruling class sets itself is to keep the lower orders undeveloped, without powers of critical thought. When one thinks of a country like Russia, there right to the very end of the tsarist regime the Minister of education was more of a minister of *de-education*.^{*} in Shchedrin's phrase.⁶ If a society wanted to open a school the Minister would not allow it; if a town wanted to have a university the Minister would not allow it; if there was a talented professor he was driven out, abroad; if the students fought for the schools to extend their scientific activities, the students were sent to serve in the army. This was the regular policy of the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Education was like a department of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The latter Ministry took care that schools should be under its authority.

But even in Russia the Ministry of Finance (which had an interest in balancing the budget, and realised that for this one needed developed capitalism, that without it Russia must fall hopelessly behind other countries, since a non-capitalist country will always be beaten by a capitalist one)

^{*}The Russian phrase, here attributed to Shchedrin, plays on the word for "education" literally meaning *enlightenment*, so the Minister was one of "darkenment".—Tr.

insisted on the need to build up the schools, and got into a sharp conflict with the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Finance established its polytechnical colleges, its schools of commerce, on the best West European models. And in truth you cannot keep the people in ignorance if you want to have skilled workers, if you want good shop assistants, if you want a peasant who can read a popular journal on agriculture and improve his farming accordingly.

Countries with general literacy, countries with a good, even if bourgeois, educational system, can have relatively good soldiers, farmers, and workers. And when Western Europe became convinced of this it paid concentrated attention to the people's schools.

However, it did not want the people's schools to give the people full knowledge. What good would that do them? They needed training so that they could read and write, but you must have the priest right there to see that they got as much Christian poison as possible fed them at the same time. A man of the people should acquire technical knowledge up to a certain limit, but without any serious scientific training, and the most important thing was to bar his way forward from the narrow sphere of the elementary school to any higher school.

And this was done so skilfully that in Russia, for example, the number of people of peasant and working-class origin who went on from elementary school to secondary school was only a quarter of one percent. One in four hundred might get to a school of a higher level, if someone used patronage on his behalf or if he was the sprig of a rich peasant, etc.⁷

Thus a man from the people receives education for at the most three or four years and is then thrown out of school. If he should succeed in getting any further education at continuation classes in the evenings, that will be only to raise his skill in his trade. It is all done with a view to not letting a man get full knowledge and so too easily turn into a Social-Democrat, for instance. This is why in Germany, in France, in England, in all the European countries, there is no way onwards and upwards out of the lower schools. In America it is not quite the same. There the percentage of workers or small farmers who reach higher schools is much greater, 4 to 5 per cent at least. Why is this so? Amer-

ica is not so afraid of men risen from the people. The schools are structured in such a way there that a small percentage of urban workers and of farmers do get there, but the school does its best to cultivate a bourgeois consciousness in them, to give the schoolboy the idea that he should turn away from his own people. And one cannot imagine anything more repellent than these people—ashamed of their parents, ashamed of their comrades in the lower school, because these dress differently, eat differently and are treated differently by the ruling classes. And it is a great point that the German policy of not admitting workers and peasants to secondary school has its disadvantages for the bourgeoisie, because talented workers remain within their own working class, and for this reason there are very many talented working-class leaders in Germany. Eventually the number of class-conscious administrators and organisers belonging to the Social Democratic party increased to a very imposing level in Germany. America, on the contrary, is cleverer. She has no remnants of feudalism, she makes these men officers in her army, raises them up to be engineers (but meek ones), and if it were not for the emigration which has taken a constant flow of poor folk into the country—from Poland, from Russia, from Germany—there would be absolutely no socialist leaders in America. The socialist leaders there are in most cases Italians, Jews, Poles and Irishmen, who have gone there from Europe. The American of established stock, as soon as he goes to school and it is noticed that he has ability, is trained—to do the right tricks. In school the knowledge imparted is exclusively of a practical nature. There history is taught in the spirit of “patriotism” and class, there religion is taught and poisons the child’s understanding, after which all the sciences are taught at a crude, basic level, and only for a period of four years. At twelve years old a boy has nothing more to learn, he goes off as an apprentice to mill, factory or workshop, he is pushed out of school, his education is finished.

The bourgeoisie has trouble with the teaching of religion. The famous German pedagogue Paulsen,⁸ for instance, asserts that the teaching of Scripture in school, which is obviously at variance with the scientific lessons given by other teachers, gives pupils a sense of mistrust towards the school. When they have realised that the Bible tales they

are told are anti-scientific inventions, the children stop believing the other teachers with their "patriotic" tone and other preachings. This is why, in Paulsen's opinion, the class school whose task it is to process small humans in the interests of the ruling classes should get rid of its weakest point, that is teaching Scripture. Another famous pedagogue, on the other hand, Foerster,⁹ insists that all attempts to run the school without Scripture do not come off well for the privileged classes. In no way is it possible, he complains, to convince little peasants and proletarians that they should shed their blood for a homeland in which they are exploited pariahs. The justice of such an order of things cannot be rationally defended, and only if one brings in the will of God and the idea of the next world can one "patriotically" educate, i.e. in fact poison, the heads and hearts of the pupils. The French, having abandoned Scripture for roughly the same considerations that Paulsen indicates, have tried to replace it by bourgeois civic ethics. The textbook of these ethics, according to Buisson,¹⁰ who is a radical and no socialist, is the limit of idiocy.

Thus bourgeois political thought tosses and turns: with the priests you get stupidity, but without the priests you cannot get by; education really does become a more and more difficult matter. The cultural level has already risen high enough for it to be hard to lead a little German or Frenchman by the nose. He is beginning to use his own eyes to look at everything, hence the crisis in the schools.

How can one manage things so that the schools send out loyal subjects who will go off without question to die for the prison in which they are exploited? It is a difficult problem.

But do not think that matters are any better when it comes to the secondary school. In Western Europe the secondary school was organised in such a way that children of the same age as those in the elementary schools started to attend it, but these were children of the bourgeoisie. So that poor children should not get in, fees were set high. They are fee-paying schools, and the fees are such that a worker has no possibility of paying them; there are some free places, so that children from petty-bourgeois families can get in. Here we find put into practice the slogan proclaimed by D. A. Tolstoi, that high school is no place for

the children of cooking women¹¹—this is a slogan common to all the bourgeoisie. The principal product of these schools is officers for the various services—whether this is the army, or industry, or bureaucracy in general; here we have the mass on which capital relies as on *its very own*, these are *its assistants*, there to govern the rest.

When a government is very rotten, when it is behind the times, when it is a monstrosity, as it was in Russia, then such a government displays the greatest possible distrust of even its own officers. When the intelligentsia is in every respect repressed, when the country is kept in such a state of ignorance, of barbarity, that a doctor cannot earn a living although there are no doctors, that writers live in Siberia and are forbidden to write although there are no journalists available—then it is only natural that the intelligentsia too should be against the government. This is a feudal, landowners' government. Its mistrust of high school is expressed in the fact that only the Black Hundred men get appointed heads of high schools (gymnasias). Textbooks and other books of colossal stupidity are produced, and the vast majority of educational establishments are so organised that they are of no use whatever even to the state. Pride of place goes to the dead languages. Once upon a time these dead languages, Latin for instance, were very important. Once in a Europe that was Catholic throughout writers wrote all their books in Latin; Englishmen, Italians and Poles all wrote in Latin. It was the international language of those days.

Today Latin has lost all importance. Utterances to the effect that the worlds of Greece and Rome can be studied only using the dead languages are just not true. In the "classical" secondary schools somewhere in the background you find the history of culture, falsified and distorted, and taught by the history teacher for two or three hours a week, while every day you have grammar, rules and exceptions, drummed into you—all attention is concentrated on the mere form of the language.¹²

The justification produced for this is that it all supposedly forms the mind, that it is good for a child to learn something that bores him, something quite unnecessary to him. A special sort of gymnastic training! In fact it is done to block up the brain of a person who has no need of gram-

mar, who will forget it all, but who does need to display submissive obedience, to listen and read what he is told to. These poor dummies of high school boys sit there in their uniforms not daring to stir, they must answer when called on and keep quiet the rest of the time. Lessons are set from here to here, they have to learn off what is set; all the way it is obedience to orders just as in army barracks. The amount of knowledge they take away with them on leaving high school is minute. The universities and technical colleges, for instance, used to be horrified by lack of preparation of the human material they were sent.

Those who attended "modern" high school were a bit better, but to make you see the difference between the modern schools and the old high schools I will tell you the following. When Wilhelm II came to the throne, he was approached by pedagogues who were in favour of the modern schools, who said, "We need good commercial travelers, we need good captains, we need good book-keepers and engineers. Why the devil do you clutter up our children's minds with Greek and Latin? We categorically demand to be given useful schools." And Wilhelm, who had imperialist aims in view, in consequence of which Germany is now brought to ruin, Wilhelm took the same standpoint: one must teach useful things, because Germany needs to extend trade and industry, and in war it is good organisation that wins.

But the dyed-in-the-wool "classical" teachers replied, "Your Majesty, you are about to make a great error. The modern schools will give you, it may be, better specialists in this field or that, but not nearly such good and loyal subjects. If you want really loyal subjects, only a classical education will provide them."¹⁵

Now this is a perfectly correct statement of the case. Wilhelm just replied that he didn't mind if they were not good subjects, so long as they were a bit cleverer. Later on he repented. At a later period he became a positive opponent of science, to the point of sometimes expelling famous workers in the natural sciences from the universities on account of their political views.

The bourgeois school in America and Western Europe is somewhat better than the Russian version. There the intelligentsia has been reliably bought over by the bourgeoisie,

so there is no reason to be particularly nervous about letting such an intelligentsia have knowledge. An efficient engineer is well aware that arrangements will be made for him to acquire stocks and shares in the company that he will work for, that he will have a very high salary and live all the better, the more money he manages to squeeze out of the workers on his employer's behalf. A lawyer, a journalist, a doctor—in the majority of cases these are people who were well and truly bought over in advance, in their fathers' time, people who represent a force supporting the bourgeoisie of its own free will rather than under compulsion. For the Russian government, though, the words *revolutionary* and *student* used over a long period to be synonymous. The government was obliged to wage a continual struggle against the people as soon as it got any education, yet it was not possible to provide no education—officials and specialists were needed. And the Russian government writhed on the horns of this dilemma. But note that as soon as bourgeois freedom arrived in Russia, part of the student body was found on the side of the bourgeoisie, against the proletariat and its ideals. During the Moscow revolution students fired on workers and formed the cream of the White Guard units,¹⁴ because they believed things would be better for them with the bourgeoisie than with the proletariat: "Deuce knows what will go on with the proletariat, they are a rough, ignorant lot, we shall have to take orders from some clodhopper or other; that won't suit."

In Europe the secondary schools are more rationally organised, but none the less badly organised, the bourgeoisie simply cannot bring itself to abandon the scholastic approach. The secondary school is best run in America, and we need to look very carefully at how the American bourgeois have arranged the schools for their children. Much of what we are introducing into our unified labour school is a socialist application of methods made current in the best bourgeois schools in America. But the bourgeoisie is scared to make teaching entirely realistic.

When a science has to be pursued to its ultimate conclusions, every science invariably turns out to be full of socialist tendencies. These ultimate conclusions not only shatter any religious ideas into little bits, they also make

it quite unthinkable to defend the bourgeois system. If an intellectual, a real intellectual, a sincere one whose mind is not occupied with thoughts of how much he will be earning, whom he will marry and how he will set up house, but who really wants to be a good doctor or a good teacher—if he devotes himself seriously to his science and thinks it through to the end, he will inevitably become a socialist. For how is a good life to be built? Is it not the natural aim of every thoughtful, socially thinking man to work with others to organise a harmonious life, in which all sides of a man shall find development and in which these developed people shall live in brotherly cooperation one with another for the happiness of all? Such great educationists as Rousseau,¹⁵ Pestalozzi,¹⁶ Herbart¹⁷ and Froebel¹⁸ could not fail to approach this task in the light of just such a wide ideal. Science has always pushed people in the direction of socialism, if they were honest and had a broad enough outlook.

The engineer has to pose the question: how to produce as much as possible with the least expenditure of effort? how to organise the economy so that competition does not cause losses? And he will say that first of all one must get rid of capitalism, since competition is an immense waste of resources, since the basic task of technology is to enable man to produce as abundantly as possible while working in conditions as little noxious as possible to himself, and to knit enterprises together into a rational system. An honest doctor will realise that treating illness is a palliative, that the thing of first importance for a doctor is prophylaxis, social and sanitary work. What is needed is good housing, removal of the need to work too hard, and proper nourishment, and people will become a hundred times healthier—and only socialism can give all that.

Not a single intellectual who considers his work as a specialist in all its implications can fail to be a socialist. So if he is not to become a socialist one must kill his conscience, make him into a being without conscience; but it is not always possible to do this.

In consequence of this, outstanding intellectuals often rebel, and a whole list of famous names, especially in the recent period, have come over to socialism. Middling people are more easily bought, but it is not a bad idea to pull the

wool over their eyes first, as a precaution. In the last resort it is still better for them not to know the full truth. Hence falsification and trickery of all kinds. Hence you will find the secondary schools even in Europe keeping to the old style of teaching. You will meet any number of people who have been through secondary school but who cannot give you a sensible account of the simplest production process. Their education has been predominantly literary. The secondary schools of a technical type turn out people with specialist knowledge who are barbarians in every other respect; their graduate knows only his own little part, and nothing about anything else. This is how the secondary school is organised.

What can we, as socialists, offer instead of this class school? First of all we must not have separate elementary (or "people's") schools and secondary schools. Every boy and every girl, whatever family he or she is born into, goes to one and the same first class, to the unified labour school (first stage). Equally, each one has the same right to go on, after completing the four years of the first stage, to the four years of the second stage. There is one, unified school for all.¹⁹ Of course there is a proviso here: in order to give every boy and girl the right to schooling, we must have more schools, an incomparably greater number of schools than we have now. Until the country's economy gets on its feet the school will remain far from its ideal, for it depends upon the economy. But it does not follow from this that we should not have these ideals before us. Far from it, we must take this sacred obligation upon ourselves.

Matters are worse when it comes to the schools of the second stage, for this second stage is what corresponds to the former classical high schools (*gymnasia*) and modern schools (*realnoye uchilishche*). There are very few of them in Russia, they were introduced purely for the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia; there are so few of them that whereas the primary schools were able to take in 60 per cent of all children, these could not cater for even 10 per cent. We have to increase the extent of the second-stage school system ten times over, and second-stage schooling requires laboratories, equipment for studying physics etc., properly trained teachers, and so on. So huge is the task facing our country. It can be tackled only over many years.

What are we doing, then, proclaiming the principle that every child from the first-stage school can go on to the second stage, when we have not the ability to ensure this for all children? We must take the standpoint of transferring the most able. Often the more able child will prove to be the one who has had more preparation, who has better home surroundings and can extend his knowledge more rapidly than the peasant or proletarian child. Therefore it seems to me right, in the highest degree, to give preference to children from the labouring part of the population. We run no risk whatever in this. It is not true that in doing this we shall be transferring slower and less gifted children to the second-stage schools. On the contrary, there is a vast number of talented children among the mass of peasants' and workers' children who previously could not go to secondary school just because their circumstances were worse than those of children with a bourgeois-intellectual background.

We call our school the unified *labour* school. What does this mean? It means that the bourgeoisie inherited from the scholastic school its "schoolroom" way of teaching, i.e. the school of the book, the textbook, the oral lesson given by the teacher, and the oral answer given by the pupil, who is sitting still at his desk for a given number of hours, the school of the strictly divided time-table and of learning off by heart. We consider this school to have been utterly condemned by pedagogic science. Even bourgeois educationists, the best of them, have moved away from this.

The first idea of the labour principle is that the child should perceive the subjects of instruction through labour, i.e. through living, active processes. When a girl plays with dolls she is preparing to be a housewife and a mother; when a boy plays war games he is preparing to be a fighter; children are forever imagining themselves as grown-ups, forever playing at being grown-ups, and by play they are practising what later they will be doing in reality.

Play is a method of self-education. "Schoolroom" teaching ignores this fact, it says: a child wants to run about—make him sit still; a child wants to make things himself, to occupy himself with something interesting—sit him down to his Latin! In a word, it is a struggle against a child's very nature. We take exactly the opposite standpoint. We

say: the whole task of the kindergarten and of the first years at school is to help children to play usefully! When children dance, sing, cut things out, mould material into shapes, they are learning. Those in charge of them must so choose their games that every day fresh knowledge is emerging, every day the children are gaining something, every day they are able to learn this or that small skill. And all this in such a way as to be interesting for them.

In the first-stage school the same trend prevails, but from play the transition must be made to work, in the widest sense of the word; things must be so organised that the children acquire knowledge *while playing, but at the same time working*. Work, after all, is a cheerful thing so long as it does not go too far and produce fatigue; the teachers must help the children to form themselves into groups, must select occupations and direct them towards the acquisition of specific information. They must set particular aims to be achieved, they must give the children prepared material on which to work and reach conclusions. The essence of the new way of teaching is not rote learning, not setting a lesson and asking for answers from it, but going on excursions and walks, making sketches, models, all manner of working processes through which the child himself enriches his own experience.

Let us take, for example, geometry; you say, "Here is our yard: divide it up; on part of it there will be a garden for growing plants, on another places for keeping animals, etc. Let's do that together." And the children will start thinking and wondering how the yard can be divided evenly into the parts needed. And at this point you show them simple methods of measuring, surveying—the measurement to plan means surveying. In just the same way, when you go on to three-dimensional geometry you and the children together make and paste up cubes, pyramids, spheres. The child is doing the sticking together himself, he is making these bodies himself, getting acquainted with them at first-hand. "Make a regular cylinder out of this piece of wood." The child will spoil one piece and then another; let another child give him some help.

Instead of teaching geography from a map, you first go out and show what a real hill and a real river are like, what a plain is, how one can measure the ups and downs

of the ground. Together with the children you make a plateau and a mountain peak out of clay; the whole class can produce a map of their own locality, and later on one of some part of the Republic—the Crimea for instance. This is what is called “teaching through work”. No one can forget knowledge acquired in this way.

Let us take for instance another method, teaching through theatre. The children, for example, are to prepare a show for some school festival, using their own resources. This is a marvellous lesson, an act of group labour! The **main** point here is that dramatisation is of course a principal element in play. When children play with dolls or at “being” robbers, this is something very close to theatre! Suppose we are learning about the primitive period of human cultural history. Let’s live for a week in summer as savages, go into the woods, light fires by using flints, cook our own food, and so on. We can live it through in the same way when studying life in the patriarchal family. Let’s act it, and we have something really interesting!

You are studying, say, medieval times, the children have to grasp it themselves: get them to try and describe, to draw, what the relationship was between a guild artisan and his customer, or between a suzerain and his vassal, with the clergy represented too; describe the scene so that the child’s interest is roused; from such a lesson he will take away such an understanding of the Middle Ages that he will never forget, for he has lived through it, it is in his blood.

This kind of teaching *through play* is extremely important.

A great deal of emphasis has to be given to drawing, in all this. I am not speaking of aesthetic demands, of teaching artistic skill, but of drawing as a necessary means of communication—like writing, or speaking. He who cannot draw is illiterate. In America a schoolteacher has to draw the whole of the lesson he gives. When he is asked how a caterpillar is formed, he will draw you one straight away while you watch, and each child has to try and do the same. A pencil or a piece of chalk in a man’s hands, when he is addressing a large audience, is one more organ of his speech. One must be able to illustrate one’s words.

Children are out for a walk—have them draw it. There’s

such and such a building—draw it. There's a tree that we haven't seen before—once you're home, jot down a drawing of it from memory. As a *croquis*²⁰ or sketch, draw the house you live in, a plan of how it is built, where the bed stands, where the window is. These sketches and illustrations are exceptionally important things, because in life such things will be required a million times. If you have given the children an assignment to organise this undertaking and that,—take a sheet of paper, map out a scheme or organisation. The pencil as a draughtsman's tool and as a means of illustration is an absolutely essential item.

Such is the first realisation of the labour principle in the school.

Besides this, the labour school has another purpose also. We cannot turn out literary intellectuals as the former secondary school used to do. The labour school must teach all to work. That is, we must not only pay attention to the subjects of school study being perceived *through work*, but teach the children *work itself*.

Here we find many supporters of this idea, including intellectuals who are disciples of Lev Tolstoy,²¹ they too preach orientation on work. It is easy to understand this aim not in the Communist sense but in the Tolstoyan. The Tolstoyans believe that a man must be able to build his own stove, bake his own bread, make his own boots, so that he can himself perform all the services he needs, and the better he can do this the less he needs other people. This is a petty-bourgeois ideal.

The Communist system is based upon large-scale industry, on factories and mills. How can you make a man who works in a factory producing straps, say, or nails, do everything for himself when he gets home too! No, we do not want his wife to do the washing, we want there to be one large steam laundry where everyone's washing is done, we do not want him to make his own dinner, we want there to be well-equipped mess halls for all. The Communist system transfers everything to an industrial basis, it aims not at everyone doing everything for himself, but at emerging from the tyranny of petty labour to huge social establishments.

Of course we cannot give all this to the children immediately. Of course petty-bourgeois and peasant households

exist in Russia and will continue to exist for a long time yet. And the peasants, so far as they set us their requirements on trade schools, tend towards the craft approach: "You teach my lad so he'll be able to forge horseshoes and make clothes too." We cannot say that today this is already unnecessary. We have to give knowledge of this sort, especially in the countryside, but our basic trend is not in this direction, so when the labour school is, often, given the character of Tolstoyan doing-things-for-yourself, this is quite contrary to the true socialist idea.

Sometimes you ask children what they have been taught in the last year. They say, "Not much, we didn't have time for lessons." "So what have you been doing?" "We've been doing things for ourselves, every day we carried firewood, got the food ready, peeled the vegetables." Now if children stoke the stove in school it should, maybe, not be done for the sake of "doing it yourself", but in order to discover in practice what combustion means, why wood burns and gives out heat. Through every action, even preparing soup, one can explain the whole world and its laws. But often we do not find any regard for the instructional aspect. We are told, "Well at least they have been taught how to work, they used not to like getting their hands dirty, and now that does not scare them, they carry the slops and everything." This is a purely Tolstoyan approach. The point of the exercise appears not as the production of a true citizen of a Communist republic, but as breaking down in the children of intellectuals the repulsion felt for crude forms of physical labour.

I have heard from not very clever supporters of the unified labour school even the following: every factory in Russia must be productive, so the school has to justify its existence too. One can get the children doing dressmaking or woodwork, sell what they make on the market or use it for barter, or hand it over to the Council of the National Economy and get money in return, and then the school will be costing nothing. This displays utter lack of understanding that a school does not produce goods, but people with knowledge. That is its product. The product is in the knowledge and skills of the pupils, everything else is subsidiary. Of course children should be accustomed to real work which is actually useful; one must not invent unreal,

unwanted work for schools, making little fretwork frames and suchlike, work of that kind is worth nothing. One must think of work children can do with results that are educational. Work in school must be educationally justified, i.e. it must be done in amounts which enable the child to learn, and if a child works and gains nothing, then that is a crime on the part of the school.

Work has no right to exist in school for even one hour, unless through it the child becomes more knowledgeable and more skilled. This does not mean that we should condemn the idea of work being done in first-stage schools. On the contrary, the Americans quite correctly are developing the idea that skill in using the hands needs to be developed. So it is very useful if the children of a first-stage school have a workshop for metal-work, if they can have some training in woodwork and in turnery, if they learn how to measure up, set up and make some little thing. To teach children in the first-stage school to use simple tools is a good thing. Even "doing things for yourself" can be excellent if it is skilfully guided. Carrying our minor repairs to school premises, or working in a kitchen-garden, or looking after the smaller animals—rabbits, goats,—this is extremely important, but care must be taken that the children are not over-tired, and that always observations should be made and experience enlarged. One should not start keeping cows simply for the sake of getting milk—this has in some places led to unfortunate results—but one should help children to acquire, through taking the trouble to look after cows, a whole range of zoological, physiological, technical, and veterinary knowledge, etc.—in a word, the maximum amount of information must be extracted.

As regards the second-stage schools, things are quite different here. At the second stage, starting from age 10-12, we must accustom children to real, technical—accessible to their age-group—large-scale social production in the factory setting. According to our syllabus this is to be done polytechnically, i.e. we are not aiming to turn out by the end of this period—12 to 16 years of age—a trained craftsman or skilled worker, someone fully qualified to work in a particular department in the metal-working industries or in tanning. We must make it our aim that at 16 a boy should leave school having some idea of what industry is

in general, that he should have a clear understanding of the structure of a factory, of a steam engine, of a dynamo, of transmission systems, of the most important types of lathes, of how a factory is divided up into shops and sections, that he should know how the stores and the despatch department operate, how the raw material comes in, how the works office functions—that he should visualise all these things clearly. He should have worked in all the parts of a factory, maybe only for two weeks in each.

A school comes to a factory, it splits up into groups, goes off to various shops to work, and after a few days the work-places change over. When the children get back to school they sum up what they have learned by giving reports and by debate; then the teacher brings it all together into a single picture. He will put questions to this pupil and that, and the idea of what that factory is all about will be fixed firmly in their memories. If they already know one factory, they will find it easier when they go to another. The teacher will point out what is the same and what is different, and why. It does not matter if the children do not get acquainted with a great number of different types of production. It is sufficient if they have gained a knowledge of the most important of these. It would be desirable, ideally, for every boy or girl leaving school to have already some knowledge of the metal-working industry, the textile industry, and the chemical industry. These types of production they should be shown.

Our country is backward, there are not many factories and mills. There are some towns which have none. There are many factories not working. We encounter enormous difficulties in this direction, but the chief problem is the lack of training among teachers. If several factories cannot be viewed, then visit one, as an example, and then by reading, through discussion, using drawings, bring out how one sort of factory differs from another. If there are no other places of industry, the railways can be of great help, the study of locomotives and of railway workshops. Large steamships, post and telegraph stations—these can be made use of in small towns. One can utilise any steam-powered machinery, be it a print shop or a power station providing electric light. As the network of factories expands, as we become able to take children to see what they should,

to make longer excursions, this will get evened out. During their four years the children will see a considerable number of industrial establishments, and these must not only be visited, but stayed in for a sufficiently long period. Then it will be possible to make this the basis on which all school subjects rest.

The central, basic subject is the history of human culture—how all the forms of human culture have developed on the basis of the economy. In studying the steam engine you will relate, with illustrations, how this appeared, what there was before it; every lesson will be made very much more fruitful by the impressions the child receives from its acquaintance with industry. Industry is such a rich field, it includes questions of chemistry, physics, health and hygiene, strictly economic matters and those of class and politics also. The teacher only rarely has to tell the story himself, he will say to the pupil, "You look in such and such a book; ask the workers questions yourself; work it out for yourself." In this way the ability for independent mental activities is acquired. Later you can introduce the giving of reports or papers. On the textile mill in Russia, for instance—how it appeared, when it appeared, and how it is structured. The pupil is to prepare himself to make the report, to collect his material; you must indicate some main threads to be followed up in books, indicate whom he should question; and he himself reads the report. Then there will be discussion of it.

Things must be so set up that the pupil learns nothing by rote, but discovers everything for himself.

Not long ago a talented man who wants to reform a pharmaceutical business was saying to me that one could achieve immense results if one got children to look for certain medicinal plants, using an information sheet, and then to dry these. At one and the same time you are teaching children to look at and understand the characteristics of plants, giving them an excellent lesson in botany, and you are amassing a vast amount of valuable material for the pharmacist. It is an absolutely right idea. Let the children know that they are doing independent, useful, needed work. Of course one must not overtax a child, one must assist him, but let him look, let him search around a little. Then you can say to him that there exists such and such a law,

such and such a formula, which will explain a lot to you; now try and make sense of this particular case in the light of this law. Suppose you want to give the children a concept of the air. You draw the child's attention to the fact that objects fall at different rates, a stone faster, a feather more slowly, while an airfilled balloon goes upwards—now think about it, find an explanation of why this is so. Perhaps he will say that the last object is lighter than air, the second of approximately the same weight, and the first heavier than air. Maybe he will think that it depends on the volume of the objects, but will not be able to give you any other formula, and you will have to give him a lead.

The children must acquire, at first through play, and later with an ever-increasing element of work, knowledge of a number of items which must be previously indicated in the syllabus, so that the teacher can at the year's end check on himself—has he given them all that is needed. He can divide his year into shorter periods with calendar stages. In the period of the first-stage school children should learn particular forms of work—carpentry, metal-work, perhaps, and so on. And the sort of thing that went on in progressive bourgeois schools: vegetable-growing and gardening generally, looking after animals, the terrarium, the aquarium—all this is useful during the first stage. During the second stage we transfer the centre of gravity, as the main things, to technology, but we are producing not specialists, but people who have a knowledge of all technology, more or less. He knows what industry is in general, and, accordingly, he has received a lively conception of society from the economic and historic point of view, and of the laws of physics, of chemistry and of biology.

Russia, being an agrarian country, can never lose sight of agriculture. For the vast majority of the Russian population the town is something to which they have little access. Although it enters into our plan that country children should at least make extended excursions to towns, this involves difficulties, and it will be rather the town children who make excursions to the country. There are not so many of them, and the countryside is vast. But for those who live in the country the labour school willy-nilly assumes an agricultural rather than an industrial character. Indeed, we shall not have got our labour school properly under way

until we have made every village school into an establishment for the study of agriculture.

The country school must be agricultural. Just now I have travelled round not less than thirteen uyezds, I have been in Russia and in the Ukraine, and have seen many different schools and talked a good deal with the peasants about schools.

By and large, the peasants are dissatisfied with the labour school as it is today, although in very many cases the teachers, both men and women, are doing their best to make this idea a reality. But what is the situation? A woman teacher has received, say, Blonsky's book or a pamphlet by Kalashnikov,²² she has a fair idea of the industry-based school, but there are no factories, there are no lathes available. How can she put it all into practice? But she has also read that eurhythmic gymnastics is a good thing, that modelling is a good thing, and so is drawing, while a lot of learning from books is bad. So she organises things so that the children study grammar very little, arithmetic very little, but spend an enormous amount of time modelling, drawing, dancing and singing. The peasants are alarmed, and say, "There you are, they took the icons away, they don't teach you what's what any more, they stopped teaching Scripture, now they spend the whole time singing and dancing. It used to be better in the old days—if the kids got a bit cheeky the teacher would give them a good clout, but now it's got so bad that if I raise my hand to my lad he'll say, 'Dad, that's forbidden under Soviet power!' They're going to turn out good for nothing, that's no good to us, we don't want that sort of school and we're not going to feed that teacher."

And in his way the peasant is right. He thinks that as in the good old days a child should be drilled, and beaten, and have the fear of God put into him, and be taught reading and writing, and all the rest is quite unnecessary. These are bad ideas, but it is true, after all, that in the countryside aesthetic schooling is a secondary thing. When I came to one school and saw all the walls covered with children's drawings, and realised that a very great deal of time had been given to this, I understood that it must have a depressing effect on the peasants. The trouble is that the teacher knows little about agriculture and nature and, there-

fore, cannot teach much to the children, "she can't tell a rake from a shovel", as the peasants say, and so they cannot respect the school.

At the same time, the Russian peasant is terribly ignorant himself on agricultural matters; if the Russian peasant practised the kind of farming you find in Germany, we should have harvests six times the size of the biggest yield you can find in Russia now. And if the scientific methods now used in America were followed, one cannot even foretell the results, as the Americans have got matters so organised that they need neither sun nor rain. They have quite done away with the concept of the bad harvest. They determine what the length of grain should be, and what the number of grains in the ear, for this or that variety of wheat; they change the characteristics of soils by adding various substances or by introducing micro-organisms, and perform real miracles in ensuring a good harvest. Compared to them our peasants are real, genuine savages—but if our schools could give them some help on this point, then they would pay it some respect.

Russian scientific agronomy must reach out its tentacles to the peasantry through the teacher and through the children. For this purpose we are at present doing our best to organise autumn and spring campaigns of our own, during which the children will take part, under the teacher's guidance, in the work in the fields, and will get simultaneously a lesson in natural science and a lesson in agriculture. We have to bring teachers together for short courses at which agronomists will give lectures. In the first year of course we cannot do much, but in a few years' time we shall succeed in giving every country teacher a fundamental knowledge of agronomy, in seeing that he or she receives journals on agriculture and builds up a library of books on the subject, and will really be able to tell the peasant something—about the new types of agricultural equipment and how to repair them if they go wrong, and to advise on rational use of fertiliser, and so on. To change the whole peasant economy, to raise it to a new level—that is the job of Narkomzem²³ (the People's Commissariat of Agriculture); but if the school can introduce knowledge of this kind into the irrational peasant economy, the peasant will have respect for the school. We have issued directives that every

school is to have a piece of land. The teacher needs to develop gradually on that land a model orchard, a model apiary, and within the bounds of possibility a model field.

One must add the political dimension. As the resolution of the Eighth Congress of the Party stated, the school must be a source of knowledge, of labour education and of civic education.²⁴

Every village school must be a centre of education not only for the children, but for adults as well, i.e. every school—this is our aim—must have a small bookshop and a library/reading-room, and a small extra-mural centre where lectures are given for the adult population.

The school must be a centre of propaganda, an agitation-centre. As part of the system of school and extra-mural education it must strive to do one better than the priest, to kill off religious prejudices, to fight the power of the kulak, to combat prejudices of all kinds including those of the Social Revolutionaries; to lay out before the peasant a correct understanding of what the Communist system is, what the Soviet Republic is, what the revolution is and how it happened, what its aims are; to use the newspapers, to use each day's information to carry this propaganda on constantly, both through the children to the parents and to the parents directly.

And then our teachers, who should of course have not 50 to 60 children each under their charge, but not more than 25, will become the bearers of enlightenment to the countryside. And we must not say this with scepticism: it will be so one day. Now is the time we must do this. The most important thing is to set our aims correctly.

The state is in our hands. Yes, we are overcoming our enemies, we shall cope, not at once but we shall cope, with the economic problems. The time will come when the education front will be denoted as the most important front, when the slogan will be "All for Education"—then we shall go forward, and all that I have spoken of will be made fact.

There are some people who say that for two and a half years we have been struggling like mad, and nothing has been done yet. But everything cannot be done at once, here one has to go through definite stages. And to say now that it would be better to be realistic and to go back to the old school—this is the greatest possible mistake.

We cannot retreat from our Communist ideals, even though the realisation of them may be very difficult. Both the peasant and the worker know very well that nothing can be made on the lines of "One, two—and there's your ship". When the task is a great one—to build a gigantic edifice—one must put a very great deal of labour and perseverance into it, and not complain that the roof is not on when we are only just beginning to lay the foundations.

The Unified Labour School is different from even the best schools of Western Europe. When our *Declaration on the Unified Labour School* was translated into foreign languages, the newspaper *Norddeutscher Allgemeine Zeitung*, a paper which is bourgeois in the highest degree, wrote: "For the first time a government is mapping out a programme for a school genuinely of the people. If the Bolsheviks succeeded in achieving this, then of course they would have a school incomparably higher than in any other country But this is, of course, a chimera, it is of course utopian—they cannot do it . . ."

At that time the bourgeois thought that the Russian Revolution in general was just an episode, an experiment. Only now have they started to howl about the Bolshevik menace, now they think that it is not an experiment, but a storm on a world scale that may be their ruin.

THE ROLE OF THE WORKERS' FACULTIES (RABFAKS) *

The role of the Workers' Faculties has from the very beginning been defined, in the many utterances I have made on the subject, as being a triple one. In the first place, the heaviest damage suffered by any educational institutions has been that borne by the second-stage schools, in other words by the upper forms of the former high schools (gymnasias) and modern schools (realnoye uchilishche). This type of school, class-distinct in its intake of pupils, run by teachers who were of course better educated people than teachers in the lower schools, but who were at the same time more deeply dyed with political opinions hostile to Soviet power—opinions sometimes of the Black Hundreds (in line with the tendency of the Ministry of Education to staff places of education with its own faithful hacks), or sometimes of the Kadet** or Social-Revolutionary parties (in line with the highly intellectual background of this section of the teaching body); a school in its methods as far removed as possible not only from our ideal of the unified labour school, but from any more or less normal teaching establishment—this type of school was naturally subjected to severe criticism, and to experiments which had not always been fully thought out, and it has also been the scene of some pretty vicious sabotage. If to this one adds the fact that the second-stage school is a very delicate plant, which needs great care and great expenditure given to it, then it will become clear just how much this system was bound to suffer in the transitional period...

The Party conference which met in parallel with the Eighth Congress of Soviets went on record in favour of shortening the course in the general school to end at 15 years of age, and of organising technical colleges (tekhnik-

*Abridged.—*Ed.*

**Kadet—Constitutional Democratic Party.—*Ed.*

ums) in which the first two years of the course (lasting altogether four years) would also serve as a preparatory course for entry to places of higher education...¹

The issue is clear. If the institutions of secondary education are not functioning normally, one must take entrants to higher education from elsewhere. The laws of the Soviet Republic afford wide scope for this, since they provide practically every 16-year-old with the right to register as a student. True, this law has had to be limited, as might have been expected, firstly on account of shortage of places and secondly by the fact that practical studies inevitably require a certain level of knowledge, which must be checked on beforehand. None the less, the profoundly democratic direction of our legislation on higher education would seem to offer the possibility of renewing the student body by this kind of lateral intake.

But is it enough for the state to allow all young men and girls over 16 to make the attempt to penetrate into the university, and to urge the university to give them a sufficiently friendly welcome? No, of course it is not enough, not by any means. We have an extremely great interest in what *kind* of young people get into higher education in this way, and this is where the second role of the Workers' Faculties comes in. Their first role, arising precisely from the above-mentioned need to create additional, lateral channels for the intake of fresh forces into the universities and other higher schools, lies essentially in the necessity of having, for the many young people who have not been through secondary school, preparatory courses attached to the university itself. But we do not take just this simple view of the matter. We must, in essence, bring into being one- or two-year courses, which perhaps might be put under the control of the university teaching staff, and might take in whatever students Fate sends. But when we speak of the Workers' Faculties this is not, of course, what we have in mind. Their very title makes it clear that these are places of education intended first and foremost to increase the chances of getting into university for young people of proletarian origin.

The second aspect of the significance of the Workers' Faculties, then, is that they are not called on merely to fill the first-year courses of various higher educational in-

stitutions with persons who have done normal preparatory work, at a time when the secondary schools are functioning poorly; they are also to make it easier for the proletariat to conquer, in practice, these places of higher education, and make them its own. Why, if we held that the proletariat could only penetrate the universities by going through the normal schools, we would then automatically, under the conditions now existing, be obliged to put off the proletarianisation of the universities for many years to come. And when our viewpoint is that such a proletarianisation is vitally necessary, i.e. that both the interests of the universities themselves and of culture as a whole demand it, and that the proletariat itself has an immense need to gain possession of knowledge and to bring forth as great a number as possible of proletarian specialists—then the task of ensuring the appearance of a sweeping wave of proletarian students becomes of prime importance.

The Workers' Faculty is not simply a lateral channel bringing in more students, it is a channel calculated to bring into the universities a specific category of people—workers from mill and factory, and only secondarily elements from the Red Army and from the peasantry, not directly linked with industry. Of course the business must be put on the most correct organisational basis possible. One cannot simply accept those workers who express the wish to come in, this would cause an unhealthy overload in the Workers' Faculties, and many of those entering later become disillusioned as to their own powers, fall behind, abandon their studies, etc. There are some who do not leave, but do not study properly either, who are for various reasons incapable and who so become in the main a somewhat noisy group, treating the Workers' Faculty more as an arena of political struggle than as a place of study, and this is absolutely undesirable. The political struggle with the remnants of the ruling classes and with, say, the retrograde nature of the world outlook held by the university teachers—this is not the business of the Workers' Faculties. This is the business of the Communist Party, of the Soviet Government, and, first and foremost, of the People's Commissariat for Education and its Board for Vocational Training (Glavprofobr).² The business of students

in the Workers' Faculties is to study, to soak up knowledge all day and every day, knowledge which our comparatively very ignorant proletariat needs desperately.

From the foregoing it is obvious that the factory committees, the Party bodies and the trade unions must select and put forward for the Workers' Faculties candidates who are able young men and women, full of keenness to learn, and with some background of preliminary study. The last point, however, should not be too strictly applied. Better to add an extra preparatory year to the Workers' Faculty and so give the opportunity of going to university to particularly talented boys and girls even when they know nothing beyond the three R's, by making their course in the Workers' Faculty correspondingly longer, than to bar from entrance those who may, formally speaking, be not very literate but who have natural talent and the ability to absorb essential knowledge.

There is a mistake often made here. Many people are inclined to think that the Workers' Faculty will not provide very many students, in fact, for the place of higher education to which it is attached. Those defending this belief consider that the Workers' Faculty will decline to the status of something like a technical college or place of "higher secondary" education, which will produce graduates from its third year, say, who will be more or less skilled workers—and that will be the end of it. Maybe, they say, one in ten will become a real student, and let us rejoice if this is so, but three or five out of ten will complete the full course at the Workers' Faculty and will leave it as educated people with certain specialist skills.

This point of view is fatal. The object which the pessimists of the Workers' Faculties are thus making their own is that which is openly and properly pursued in the technical colleges. The Workers' Faculty is not a technical college, it is not a secondary school producing technicians with secondary qualifications, it is a preparatory course leading to serious university study. It is quite possible, of course, that a certain percentage of students will leave after the first, or second, or third year of study there, having acquired some knowledge which will serve them in good stead, but this is clearly not the normal course of events. The main stream must complete the preparatory course nor-

mally and flow on from there into the first year of the university.

I personally am in favour of their going on to, specifically, the first year of the university, rather than of the senior courses of the Workers' Faculty being seen as the equivalent of the university first year. I must dissociate myself as energetically as possible from those who suppose that the Workers' Faculty will itself be transformed into a university, i.e. that the senior year of the Workers' Faculty will become parallel to the first year of university. Then the latter's first year will start to wither, to lose ground, and the Workers' Faculty will start to edge out the first and then the second and the third year, and so on, and will in practice turn into a Workers' University, by crowding the old university out of its walls. This concept is radically unsound. A process of this kind, of struggle between a Workers' Faculty growing outwards and upwards and a university being enfeebled from the bottom upwards, will be a most painful and a boundlessly uneconomical one. We must conquer the university as such for proletarians, and for this purpose the Workers' Faculty must be an appropriate channel, from the further end of which will issue forth, so to speak, a supply of students for the normal lecture-theatres of an institution of higher education.

Many people, basing themselves on a false view of the Workers' Faculties as institutions hostile to the university and due to displace it, while being sincere friends to these Faculties none the less are guilty of heresy in demanding their separation from places of higher education, their independence of these. We find a curious situation. The university teachers, or that part of them which hates the Workers' Faculties, are pressing demands that the Workers' Faculties should be pushed out of the universities, walled off from them; and the most fervent defenders of the Workers' Faculties are also pressing demands that they should be taken out of the universities, they also want to erect walls between the two, and so are bringing grist to the mill of the university teachers' worst prejudices.

If however we see the Workers' Faculties as a quite specific proletarian preparatory school leading to the university, then we shall grasp that the closer its links with the university, the more its syllabus and methods are guided

by the aims of the university, the more use is made by it of the lecture rooms, laboratories, libraries and teaching staff of the university, the more advantage will accrue to us, and the more rapid will be the upward movement of the true line of organic, not hostile, conquest of the university by the Workers' Faculty.

Now to the third aspect of the significance of the Workers' Faculty. While I am an ardent supporter of the *workers' faculties* being indeed faculties, i.e. a definite organic part of the university, I am far from opposing the idea that the Workers' Faculties will have a powerful transforming effect upon the university itself. The immoderate, militant supporters of the Workers' Faculties see matters as something in the nature of the old university frigate being sunk by the new proletarian dreadnought which is being gradually constructed. For me the picture is somewhat different. Not that I am supposing—far from it—that it is only a matter of altering the constituents of the living blood circulating in the veins of the aging university body. No, we must go deeper than that. But before I say something on that subject, I would like to clear up some misunderstanding over the word “faculty”.

As we know, Faculty is the name given to one stream, moving parallel with other streams and representing one specialisation or another, these then coming together as a unity, the university. It is not the place here to give a critique of the old system of faculties and university, which was inherited by us from the Middle Ages and which is in many ways quite outmoded, but however that may be, Workers' Faculties do not in the least resemble a Faculty of Medicine or of Social Sciences, etc. In the one case faculties are divided according to the particular subjects dealt with, and have grouped around them the disciplines required for study of the given subject. In our case we have a preparatory institution, not moving parallel but being as it were a doorway to all the universities. Of course within the Workers' Faculty itself there may be appropriate separations of track, so that within it there may be something resembling faculties of medicine, science, mathematics, etc., as in the university. But this makes the Workers' Faculties even less like faculties in general. The name is an absurdity, it should be changed.

But the name is hardly likely to mislead anyone, and it is hardly worthwhile to argue over words. Meanwhile, changing the name "Workers' Faculty" to something else is pregnant with dangers. It is dangerous to separate off this workers' section of the university from other sections. When we have Workers' Faculties we are stressing, we are giving notice by so calling them, that this is an integral part of the university, with rights equal to those of other parts. And this is of particular importance. We must without fail make the Workers' Faculties a living organ of the university, or a living organ of the higher technological institute if that is what it is attached to.

So, the third task of the Workers' Faculties lies in that they not only pump new blood into the organism of the higher educational system, but change the actual morphology of these institutions. The Workers' Faculty, after all, has to teach science to a quite distinct category of people. The students of the Workers' Faculties are in one way less easy to teach than those coming from the old secondary schools. But it is true to say that this lack of previous training on their side largely relates to that needlessly scholastic element which is still present to a considerable degree in university education. All that is needed is some additional instruction in the Russian language, and perhaps in a foreign language, in mathematics, and mechanical drawing, and some systematisation of elementary scientific knowledge—and the formal entrance requirements can be met. And when it comes to taking in specialist knowledge, the Workers' Faculty students are extremely well qualified to do so. Workers from the transportation system, some of them with considerable experience behind them, are of course excellent material when it comes to apprehending disciplines and technology related to that experience, etc.

A worker is in general more mature, more developed socially, more active and more independent than the former high-school or modern-school boy. He will not permit himself, as a young man drilled behind those accursed desks might do, merely to memorise as far as possible a lecture he has listened to, although he may have listened with some attention; the worker will besiege the lecturer at his rostrum after his lecture with a mass of different questions; he will drag him back to practical applications, he

will keep up practical work with especial interest and always, thanks to the fact that he has technical knowledge and skilful hands trained by labour, he will master many things, particularly in the technical field, which a boy with secondary education would have never been able to do. The worker's particularly fresh practical common sense, his approach from the angle of practice to both the aims and the methods of technology, cannot help but have a healthy effect on the actual teaching given. All this will oblige some individual professors, to begin with, to re-consider their courses and adjust themselves to a new audience, and later will have a powerful effect on the curriculum, syllabi and methods of the whole university. The students of the Workers' Faculties, as they enter the main stream of the university, will not only force a change in its teaching in the direction of greater contact with life, greater practicality, they will gradually educate a new type of teaching staff, particularly from among the young scientists and young lecturers who work mainly in the Workers' Faculties—a staff that will be up to the new demands made upon them. In this way there will come about a conquest of the university which is not merely external, going beyond the fact that sitting in the lecture theatres there will be not only the sons of intellectuals but real workers and peasants. No, it will not be limited to that, there will be a conquest from within, a shift in all the values of the university, a purge removing from it all the old scholastic attitudes still dear to the heart of the intellectual, and an adding to the university of disciplines which the mighty voice of life proclaims to be vitally needed—and the proletarian ear is especially sensitive to that same voice.

Such is the significance of the Workers' Faculties, and from it follow the conclusions: careful preparation of the best qualified workers, particularly industrial workers, for the Workers' Faculties; constant, close contact between a Workers' Faculty and its own establishment of higher education; especial care to be taken that the Workers' Faculties in the course of their natural growth should not trample on or damage, under any circumstances, the normal institutions of higher education, that the Workers' Faculties should not spit in the university well from which they will later on be drinking; and equally great care to be taken

that the institutions of higher education should not hinder the growth of the Workers' Faculties. The institutions of higher education must realise that the Workers' Faculties will provide their food for tomorrow, that they are their future, that they are a promising young son, and they have no other. If the university wants to live (and this applies to other places of higher education also) it must take particular care of the normal development of its Workers' Faculty.

WHAT KIND OF SCHOOL DOES THE PROLETARIAN STATE NEED?

When the theme of this debate was announced, some comrades were asking me, "Is there going to be a debate on 'What Kind of School Does the Proletariat Need?'?" Here we have what seems a slight difference in formulation—the proletariat instead of the proletarian state. I cannot call these two different trends of thought, but recently there has been a glimpse or two of something in the nature of a slight deviation, to which we should perhaps pay some attention right at the start, in order to put in a correct light those few but basic theses which I shall attempt to expound to you now.

Over the recent period one has glimpsed in some statements and in some interpretations of these statements, in some resolutions and reports, for instance at the Young Communist League (Komsomol) Congress,¹ the idea that one should devote care first of all, and maybe even *exclusively* (in view of the limited resources available), to schools for proletarians, and that the idea of a monopoly of education being in the hands of the class which is now leader and dictator might perhaps be the most economical and rational educational policy for this country.

I repeat that I cannot give a single name, cannot indicate even one group that would take this standpoint. There is only a little deviation to one side, a tinge, a hint of this interpretation, this formulation, which we must from the outset condemn as a heresy, one maybe arising from very honourable feelings and very rational considerations, but none the less an undoubted heresy and deviation from the correct statement of the educational problem.

If someone were now to develop that approach, that theory, and to say: you have very few good teachers, you have very little proper school equipment; you know that the labour school you dream of can only be realised given organic, basic links with factory and mill; and you have hun-

hundreds of thousands of proletarian children and young people, not all of whom by any means are assured at present of a normal education—why not concentrate all your forces on this vanguard? why should the younger generation coming up to take our place not have all your attention and the benefit of all the resources you dispose of at present? If someone were now to formulate the problem in these terms, he would be falling into an error which may perhaps have been justified by the special features of our situation during the war, but which today would run counter to the fundamental line of our political thinking.

If you give thought to the slogan which was put forward, with a question mark and for discussion, by Vladimir Ilyich a year ago at the Party Congress, and which more than a year later was again mentioned by V. I. Lenin at the Fourth Congress of the Third International² (but this time as a statement of the considerable success achieved by the policy laid down on the previous occasion), you will see that the inner meaning of that policy lies in the following.

Outwardly, and formulated in brief, it is alliance with the peasantry, and movement forward, maybe at a slower rate, but movement forward which will be the more irresistible, the more fully the main labouring mass of the people—the peasantry—falls in behind the proletariat, the vanguard of the Russian people. And if we develop and interpret this formulation further, it means that the task of the proletariat is to build its own proletarian state out of the elements it finds present in the country, assigning to each of them its place utilising each of them for the common aim. Isolation of the proletariat from the remaining mass, its isolation from the rest of the population, transformation of the proletariat into a special camp, even though a camp of people more advanced than the rest in their level of organisation and their clarity of visualisation of their own aims—such an isolation would be a policy fraught with disaster. Only care by the proletarian government—care in all possible respects—for the whole country, for the whole economy, and first of all, of course, for that most fundamental of all foundations of Russian economic life and of the further development of our people—

the peasantry; only this is a truly correct and furthermore profoundly proletarian policy.

Thus we must, of course, put the theme we are today discussing in its correct form, as the problem of providing the best kind of school for the proletarian *state*, i.e. a state led by the proletariat in the spirit of proletarian ideology, which has as its goal the complete annihilation of classes, and which benefits all except exploiters and reactionaries.

I could speak today, in the fifth year of the Revolution, in terms as it were proper to more or less revolutionary, Marxist ideals in the sphere of education. What kind of school does the proletarian *state* need? . . . As we are speaking of the school of the proletarian *state*, we are therefore speaking of the school of the transitional period.

But even at the time of the Declaration we issued at the very start of the Revolution we foreswore revolutionary utopia. Normal ideals are like a guiding star; ideas of the very best kind of school we can visualise, given full realisation of our best pedagogical principles, can have some significance. In any case we then, in the Declaration, were more mapping out a type of school which could be realised in practice in our very best, model establishments, or which seemed achievable within the years immediately following. Today it would hardly be practical to pose the question even from this angle. It would not be difficult to repeat the basic tenets of our ideal scheme of education, but it would hardly be particularly useful.

When we say, "What kind of school does the proletarian state need?" we can promptly counter that with another formulation—"What kind of school is possible in proletarian Russia?" And we are obliged to look for some sort of combination, some sort of median between these two objectives. For if we were inclined to be too opportunist, if we took much account of possibilities, i.e. of what can easily be realised, we could find ourselves giving up even those ways of putting our ideals into practice which are far from unattainable, given maximum revolutionary energy.

At the same time, while relying on that maximum revolutionary energy, which of course in the overall scheme of things we have got, but which only in some small part,

it is true, has been coming the way of the schools (though in this respect we hope for better things),—relying on this, we still must not pose our problem in these terms: if there existed, somewhere, a more or less complete proletarian state, as a transition to communism, what kind of school would be most suitable to it? We still must set before ourselves our own direct task: what marker posts, what *immediate* marker post can we set up to guide us in our very poverty-stricken, our very neglected educational scene—to guide us along the road and in the direction that will bring us closer to the unshakable ideals of our communist educational theory, ideals which still remain dear to us and beyond question?

If we are going to discuss this in the state dimension and not in the purely class dimension, we must first of all be clear in our own minds as to what kind of school system a proletarian state should recognise as valid and fight for. In this respect, can any essential changes be made to the plan we laid down earlier, or what aspects of that plan have proved impossible to realise, on what points have doubts arisen?

You remember what this plan was. It was a plan for the creation of the unified labour school. In idea, the unification of the school as understood by Communists means that all the separation between the class school for the labouring lower orders, and the privileged class school for the middle and higher estates, must be done away with. The school must be one and the same for the whole population, in the legal sense—in the sense of the level of education to which every child has a right.

Please do not confuse, as some Communists, including some not unacquainted with educational ideas, have done on the pages of respected Soviet publications—do not confuse the word “unified” with the word “uniform”, since unification does not in the least presuppose absence of adjustment of the school to the particular conditions of the area in which it is developing. The school is variable, in regard to different pedagogical experiments and to certain differing emphases for groups of children with particular gifts, it even permits of individualisation in children’s development. All these forms, varying within the particular school, within the school system of a particular area,

and within that of the schools of the whole country, we not only admit but consider useful in the highest degree.

But I shall now point out that in this respect the Commissariat for Education over a long period committed an error in the opposite direction. It believed for a long time that the body of teachers, and the persons in charge of schools in the provinces (gubernians) and districts (uyezds), would be able to adjust to their own prevailing conditions the general ideas laid down, *by and for themselves*. And in our official curricula, maybe deliberately, we did not give enough material worked out in detail. True, in the localities a certain amount of creative work, work on the production of syllabi, did then follow, and we had many syllabi which were satisfactory, and some which were positively good, produced in various places throughout Russia. But we now see clearly that here we perhaps overshot in the direction of excessive decentralisation. We are now coming round to the idea that we must make our recommended syllabi firmer, and insist more strongly on their actual application, i.e. we must firmly and unequivocally lay down a certain minimum programme, a certain framework of basic requirements of the state in the education of children.³

The unification of the school which I was just talking about—to what degree can it, a priori, be achieved in Russia? We could, of course, have declared the lower forms of secondary school to be Soviet schools of the first stage and put them in the same official category as the village schools. We could have chopped off from them the upper forms of secondary schools and declared them to be schools of the second stage, accessible in equal measure to all those completing the first-stage school. But we were not of course so blind as not to see that this would still not mean real unification.

Even a comparative degree of unification (given the huge disproportion between the numbers of elementary schools in the country and the number of second-stage schools, which could have been created in the way just mentioned), even this demanded that there should at least be some guarantee of equality of material opportunity as regards entrance to the second-stage school, so that those gaining

entrance should be only the most gifted, the continuation of whose education would undoubtedly be more valuable than in the case of those whose education we must perforce bring to a halt at the elementary school.

You know that in round figures we have enough first-stage schools for only half our children, and that the number of second-stage schools would barely suffice for 5 to 6 per cent of children. So it is clear that roughly nine out of ten of those completing first-stage school cannot find places in second-stage school. And this fact puts at an extreme disadvantage those who live in the country as compared to those who live in towns, which destroys even comparative unification of the school system. The plain fact is that the child of a peasant family, in the vast majority of cases and irrespective of his natural talent, is going to have immeasurably less chance of going to second-stage school than the urban child has—in Soviet Russia, for some decades after the Revolution, even given that the schools do as well as they possibly can.⁴

As regards one reproach often made, on the subject of failure to realise the ideal of the unified school—that even now our second-stage school takes in a much greater percentage of children from privileged families than of children from the labouring population—this reproach is not altogether just. A partial explanation is that we would of course be quite wrong to throw out of school those on their way to completing it, and to replace them, somehow, by youngsters with no previous schooling whom we had somehow picked from somewhere. Of course this would be impossible. But over the past five years the process of democratisation of the second-stage schools, and of proletarianisation of those schools in the towns, has advanced a long way. Of course it has not yet advanced as far as it should. We have not at present got precise data, but if we could collect up detailed questionnaires on social origins (which I do not consider particularly useful educationally, and would rather refrain from)—if we could do this, it would probably emerge that the proportional representation in the second-stage schools of various strata of the population is far from corresponding to the general percentages within the urban population represented by particular social groups. But none the less there is no comparison

here between the present situation and what there was before the Revolution.

In this respect, then, the unified school is a definite advance, in terms of breaking down formal, legal barriers and moving towards democratisation and proletarianisation of the second-stage schools. But this is still an on-going process, and of course it meets with a certain resistance.

In between this legal reform and those reforms, or that revolution, which has to take place in the internal workings of the schools themselves, and which flows from the principle of polytechnical labour education—in between, there lies an area of reforms which it would not be difficult to carry through without a radical transformation of the school. Such as liberating the schools from obviously scholastic subjects, which the dead languages are and have been for the immense majority of boys and youths. Then, breaking down the system of single-sex education, which is absurd, educationally harmful, a legacy from the past; some progress has also been achieved in the direction of rational autonomy within the school, exerted directly by the pupils. Across almost the entire face of the Russian land the liberation from clearly scholastic subjects has taken place, and almost everywhere, with very few exceptions (although in the course of this year I came upon one town where co-education had not been introduced, and quite a large town too), *almost* everywhere co-education has been put into operation. Almost everywhere, too, there are the beginnings of successful school self-government, and this is one area where there is very little precisely worked out as yet, where there are many searchings in progress, some of them most interesting.

All these things do not call for major expenditure, they are things which can be prescribed on paper in the form of a decree, with some reasonable expectation that they will be put into operation and take on life, that only ill-will and inertia can paralyse their application. It is quite another matter when we come to reform of the spirit of teaching itself, i.e. to the principles of the polytechnical labour school. And here the greatest number of doubts arise.

Is a labour school, and a polytechnical school, necessary to the proletarian state? Let us start with the first aspect—

whether the labour school is necessary to the proletarian state. Here it would seem that we have on our side an exceptionally large number of votes—those, at least, of a whole large section of our immediate comrades in the Communist Party and of educationists close to it. Workers in education who to some extent part company with us when we pass on the issue of the polytechnical school, are our unconditional supporters so far as the labour school is concerned, i.e. they, like we, are convinced that school must be based on labour, but the “left-wingers” among them consider that it should also be a trade or vocational school right from the start.

Let us first pause and consider the principle of the labour school. That the school should be based on labour is beyond doubt in the minds of proletarian groupings and of educationists who ally themselves with these. The proletariat is itself a labouring class, a practical class, which can fully appreciate the educational and social significance of scientifically organised labour, based on applied science and through it on science in general. It can appreciate this excellently well, and therefore has no doubts of it being correct to organise the schools on this basis. But there can be gradations here, and if we understood the labour school in the same way as it is understood by some educationists in Germany, and particularly some in America, we would then have an even wider circle of people sharing our views.

In all conscience, there hardly can be at the present time of a progressive pedagogue or even one with any degree of enlightenment, who doubts that the material under study should be apprehended not by book learning but by visual and active means, through walks, excursions, laboratory work, drawing, modelling, constructing etc., by actively working up given themes—adducing independently found material, elaborating this in group work through discussions, group compilation of data and so on. All this is today not subject to doubt. But this side of the school is still as yet more a matter of educational experiment than of an educational system, not only in this country, but also for those countries and those progressive schools which have taken this road long ago, more or less.

To defend learning only from books would today be as ridiculous as to defend learning to read and write by re-

peating A, B, C etc.⁵ It is an entirely old-fashioned approach, and any educationist who has not grasped this is really a hoary backwoodsman. But this is not enough by any means for proletarian educational theory, although even this is a considerable advance for the children in first-stage schools. I consider that this is the most important element in the first-stage school, and it maybe that here those working in the Commissariat for Education made a great mistake.

The point is that the next step in carrying the labour school further and deeper is teaching not only *by means of* processes similar to social labour, active processes (in which the whole human organism participates, not only memory, not only the brain), but *teaching labour itself* as a social technique, and *in a practical manner* at that. The most acceptable labour processes are those which will never turn a child into an exploited worker, but have him executing the work process for the sake of, for the purposes of, his own physical and mental growth. Karl Marx too understood the educational effect of labour on pupils in this way. And this is one of the most hopeful, important, basic ideas in the field of proletarian educational thinking. And since one can fully accept this proposition as it relates to industry, in the eyes of some educationists "doing things for oneself" (i.e. domestic work—chopping wood, carrying water, cooking, cleaning rooms) has acquired merit, as being a preparatory stage and a very closely related preparatory stage leading up to the later one of real labour, an adjusting stage suitable for the first-stage school.

I am far from denying that in children's activities in school a certain place may be allocated to this doing things for oneself, but one must treat it with the greatest caution. And in the early days, especially in view of the poverty of the schools and the impossibility of hiring auxiliary staff, big mistakes were of course made in this respect. This fact was missed—that educational value attaches only to work of a specific kind, work through which more and more useful skills are learned, acquired and established, and which also yields an appreciable amount of knowledge gained, "along the way" and just because the child is working.

When John Dewey⁶ describes how one should cook and

in doing so give excellent lessons in chemistry, physics, botany, zoology, health care, and physiology, he is absolutely right. Although objections have been put to me, that if one talked such a lot while preparing a dinner something would boil over, something else would start burning, etc.—none the less I believe that his approach is more or less correct. If one approaches it *in this way*, all this can of course have educational value. But if today children are chopping wood, getting the dinner, carrying water—and doing exactly the same tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, then the result is not any great mental development, or even physical development. It is work of a pretty deadening nature. We Communists strive by all the means at our disposal to get rid of this kind of work altogether. Our ideal is to save woman, who wastes her life at such work, and the child, who gets dragged into it—to save them from all this washing of clothes, preparing of food, washing of dishes, by replacing it on a vast collective scale by industrial execution of all these chores.

Our socialist soul revolts from, would escape from this mean and petty work which makes victims of many of us, the female half in particular. To accept it as an element in education is something to be done only with the most extreme caution. And the labour school of the first stage has acquired the character of “doing things for yourself” to such an extent that one has had to hear from the mouths of children, when asked about their school work, such remarks as: “When would we be learning anything—there’s no time left when we’ve finished doing everything for ourselves!” Often this was due to the difficulties faced by the school itself. The schools have often been fighting for survival through the feeble strength of children, and often this has not been the fault of the teachers but their misfortune.

In the first-stage school there should be play, the acquisition of elementary knowledge through active pursuits, which imperceptibly change from play to something more and more serious. Only older children can directly, definitely enter on the way opened up by the second stage of the labour school, i.e. learning actually to work.

Here I must make a small exception, a proviso, which is especially important in Russia, so important in fact that

it transforms itself from a small proviso or exception into one of the basic rules of our school policy: labour on the land, which one can visualise over a whole range starting from its simplest elements, from the "work" of children's games with earth and water, through the growing of plants that even four- and five-year-olds can be allowed to share in, and the caring for animals like rabbits, or maybe a goat, right up to the gigantic prospects of scientific agricultural technology—this variety of labour (which with anything like proper handling is an extremely healthy pursuit, and one which brings one face to face with the might and the beauty of Nature) is something which must be given particular emphasis here in Russia, for nowhere else can it or should it be so widely practised as in this country.

The elementary, first-stage school (practically the only school we have in the countryside, for we have very few second-stage schools there, comparatively) must base itself wholly upon the vegetable garden, the orchard, the school animals etc., because this kind of work—given correct teaching—permits of the same variety of conclusions being drawn from it as from factory and mill, so long as we do not let ourselves be limited by peasant horizons, so long as the teacher can contrive to use this tiny school-house economy so as to draw from it, by practical means, conclusions on the horizons it opens up, trusting to the youthful reason of his or her small fellow-workers. In this respect the applicability of the labour school principle is beyond all argument, even in our industrially very backward country. Much of this programme can be carried out without any especially complicated equipment, without special workshops. Given the right approach even the urban first-stage school, and the country school especially, can be correctly orientated on this, utilising just a small plot of land, a small school "agricultural economy" (even within the confines of a town), or making extensive use of summer schools. This is a more or less possible thing.

It is quite another matter when we come to the second-stage school, when we come to teaching labour itself. Here, first of all, we are faced with the question: why the polytechnical school, rather than the technical?

The disagreements which there have been, which are

maybe still to be met with, have their own history. View-points have changed. Some people, for instance, used to agree with our basic principle. That the point is not to teach young boys a particular craft (if we are speaking of a correctly orientated school) or even a particular trade in the industrial setting. That is not the aim. The aim is to acquaint the young person with *the nature of scientifically organised labour*. Now some supporters of vocational education have taken this point of view, but have said: if you want to give an adolescent a *real* idea of labour as a *serious thing*, you cannot have him or her flitting superficially from one labour method to another, fluttering or drifting around different branches of industry; let him or her really work for a few years in one particular shop or department, so that he gets into it in depth, so that he understands it properly.

We too consider that good use can be made of one place of production, one sector of production, as an example, if—and only if—it is organised at all scientifically. This is a “half-way house” kind of viewpoint, it is an arguable point. And I make no bones of saying that here one can tip the balance too far, to one side or the other. One can get too carried away along one channel of production, and one can also take polytechnical education to mean acquainting children with practically all existing techniques, or making it so to speak pantechanical. That is not what we intend.

If we had the possibility—and I will say here that sometimes we do have the possibility—of organising a polytechnical labour school, what we would require is two or three sectors of industry, say communications, textiles and mining. One can get into each of these in sufficient depth, from the polytechnical angle, in the course of those four or five years during which the child will have them as the basis on which to build up its world outlook and to gain acquaintance with all aspects of science. But if we take a closer look at the matter, it is possible to study production over a wide range of differentiation even within one factory, since every factory has its main production process but also has repair shop and its commercial departments (office, accounts, packing, dispatch), and lastly industrial health and safety etc., which surround every

factory with a guardian wall and which likewise present a basis for very interesting studies. So that in every factory producing on anything like a serious scale we always find several major sub-sections which together offer the possibility of organising polytechnical education.

Other opponents with a hostile attitude to polytechnical education have said: all this is not the point, the point is that in our poverty-stricken land such delicate considerations are beyond our means; polytechnical education may be a very nice thing, but you are building castles in the air while there is stern reality facing us and saying, "Give me a boy of 14-15-16 who has been trained enough to be put into circulation straight away, because we must have trained hands or the country is ruined."

Again, this is a point of view with which it is in some respects impossible not to agree. It is possible that from the angle of the general, practical economic situation we might have to reach the conclusion that we cannot do anything other than this, that we must make a temporary retreat from our ideals. One can have a situation when people receive on their ration cards a minimum which from the point of view of health and nutrition is not the minimum but below it. That means there is famine in the land. And in our land there is now such a famine so far as knowledge is concerned, that no one could be surprised if we were obliged to beat a retreat in the given respect. But this does not mean beating a retreat ideologically, that we should abandon the idea of the polytechnical school in those places where it is more or less possible.

At the present time this contest of opinion has led to some fragmentation of our school system. Thus the Ukraine has completely done away with the top forms of the former secondary educational establishments and has merged their lower classes with corresponding first-stage schools, and in this way has created on the one hand a network of truncated schools (we have these too, of course) —i.e. four-year schools, and on the other hand some seven-year schools, which can exist only in very small numbers in the Ukraine itself. The others were destroyed; at the same time it was announced that young people completing the seven-year school at the age of fifteen have the right thereafter to enter technical college.

At the time we expressed doubt as to the possibility of bringing this system into working order at all rapidly. But these doubts are not the main point, for we are in favour not of technical but of polytechnical education. We were obliged to narrow down our curriculum, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party publicly, in the name of the Party, confirmed that Communists had the right to depart from our curriculum and to settle temporarily for seven-year school.⁷ So we did not quarrel with the proposition that given our great all-Russia poverty even seven-year schools must be considered the height of luxury, but we did argue with the idea that our school system will be considerably improved by issuing a decree to authorise this chopping-off of classes, and another decree to call into being numerous technical colleges, which are to spring up out of the ground "where Pompey's foot has trod".⁸

Of course not nearly as many technical colleges have been brought into being in the Ukraine as would be required if all those completing seven-year school were to find places in them. And in actual fact, as I discovered after a congress of workers in education,⁹ when I questioned very closely the Ukrainian teachers present, from various parts of the Ukraine—the vast majority of children completing the seven-year school proved to be unfitted for any practical work, and equally unprepared for entry to any other educational establishment, since the proposed technical colleges were not in fact in existence. And down there they have an unheard-of development of what is known as coaching (or cramming). This coaching on a colossal scale is to replace the old top two classes of the schools. It goes without saying that we would inevitably have found ourselves in exactly the same situation—indeed we already have quite a development of coaching here, because our secondary schools are in a poor state—but we would have found ourselves in precisely the same situation as them, if we had taken the same line. Recognising, then, that it is impossible at the present time to proceed to the organisation of a large number of technical colleges to take the children who complete seven-year schools—even if one did sacrifice the second-stage schools and their top classes—we consider that extreme caution is needed here, that schools should not be destroyed when there is no guaran-

tee that all adolescents will really find places in technical colleges.

At the last congress of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) the delegates energetically demanded that the second-stage school should rapidly be wound up, and were inclined to press us to go over without delay to a seven-year school; they were not content with a promise to speed up this process to some extent. But I will say frankly that I consider it a grave mistake, not only to make an instant change-over to this system, which from our point of view is an opportunist one, but even to speed up to any significant extent the tempo at which this process has so far been proceeding. And the congress of heads of Gubernia Departments for Education (Gubono) ¹⁰ came out in favour of even slowing this tempo down—might we not remain true to the nine-year school!

You understand, of course, that when we come down, in this discussion, to entirely practical reality, we have to admit that to have even a seven-year school is a great good fortune. We are dealing here with the "upper crust" of our children's education. Not everyone gets so far. Leaving aside the point that a correct approach to the matter would involve selecting the most able to form this upper crust—even if such selection is not being made, even if we have no guarantee that the ten per cent who get into second-stage school are really the ten per cent with the highest ability—once you take due note of that point in our current policy which proclaims that our first and most urgent task today is to create a new proletarian/peasant intelligentsia, then you will realise that the second-stage school is one channel, and should be one of the most important, leading to the creation of a new intelligentsia.

If the Chief Committee for Technical Education (Glavprofobr) states that there is an awkward gap between the establishments of higher education, in regard to their entrance requirements, and the human material being provided by the second-stage school—a gap in quantity and, particularly, in quality—then we should pay very serious heed to this, and should remember that when we defend the second-stage school, one must not talk as though the first-stage school is a democratic institution but the second-stage school is a petty-bourgeois establishment, a more aristocratic affair. One must

not talk like this, and by so doing take what is, essentially, a petty-bourgeois, populist (Narodnik) viewpoint. It is terribly important to the state to raise up the masses in general, and closest to this general upraising is the elementary school, which needs multiplying by two in order to make it universal. But we shall never achieve this result unless we conquer science from above, unless we bring into being contingents recruited from that same people, contingents many in number and trained not only in the practical experience of life, as is the whole proletariat which now holds power in its hands, but also taught systematically in the schools. This can be done by the second-stage school or some substitutes for it, which have a certain value but which cannot replace it, and should die off gradually as the second-stage school comes to occupy its rightful place.

It is necessary, then, to pay great attention to the second-stage school, to make efforts to turn it into a labour school. Whether it is a seven-year school, i.e. two final school classes and then a technical college, or a nine-year school followed by entry to higher education, is comparatively unimportant. But it is this point, this bridge of transition to either higher education, or working life, in the latter case as an already semi-qualified specialist, it is this point that we need to strengthen by all the means in our power. So, leaving aside for the present the question of whether the school is to be polytechnical, or polytechnical up to age fifteen, or whether we are now to have a strictly technical school—leaving this aside, we ask: is labour education in general, whether polytechnical or technical, labour education in the profoundly Marxist sense of which I have been speaking, i.e. based on the power of labour to develop and to educate, and linked basically with industry—is this, in general, possible in Russia or not? It is clear that it is possible—given the very greatest effort.

The first task is direct contact with industry. Russia is poorly developed industrially, she has not enough major industrial centres, and at present our industry is not working to capacity. This means, of course, that the actual surface space or area of her industry is not extensive enough to afford anchorage for all her schools, it is not possible to organise Russian schools in general around it, not even the second-stage schools alone. That is point one,

Point two, this is an exceptionally painful process. We have been speaking, after all, not of boys and girls from the second-stage school coming along and gaining a slight acquaintance, as best as one can manage, with how this or that is done in a factory or mill. This is not, of course, what we are after. What is needed is that they should really, seriously, work there. At present it is only with the utmost difficulty that this can be organised when the school is a long way from any factories or mills, when much time has to be spent getting there and coming back, and when, in addition, the factories and mills themselves often do not see the matter as something vital and important, but in terms something like this: "Some teacher-woman comes along with pupils from a second-stage school, and they all get under our feet. We are serious people, we are doing a job, get the hell out of here with your labour school. You are nothing but a nuisance."

This is very often what happens. True, sometimes it is different. Sometimes the Factory Committee comes to meet us with open arms, but this is exceedingly rare. I will even say that nowhere has such a thing been seen as a normal second-stage school getting its relations with this or that factory on a correct footing. At best we have a more or less correct organisation of the excursion method. That is fact number one. Actually, for the immediate future, when we speak of the normal second-stage school we have in our minds those schools which are in provincial towns, often without any industry, or in those quarters of big cities which have no factories in the vicinity; schools where they are at best condemned to the excursion method so far as their industrial education is concerned. And perhaps our task in this respect must be, for the immediate future, to structure our programme for this section of the child population, for children of working families attending normal, ordinary second-stage schools along the lines of extensive use of excursions to industrial establishments.

Another method is to organise small school workshops in the separate schools, and bigger ones calculated to serve the schools of a whole district. N. K. Krupskaya, for instance, has said that in France the labour, technical schools often base their work on just such school workshops and even prefer these, since they are equipped with teaching in mind.

But she correctly remarked at the time that this is of course a substitute method, not a Marxist approach. It is a method simply borrowed from the trade school, the trade school which has its own laboratories and workshops. But where this is possible, let us use it and be thankful. Where it is possible to adapt a well-equipped workshop for the use of several schools, or even to set up a small laboratory or workshop, that will be a step forward in the direction of correct orientation of the second-stage school.

We must welcome both these lines of advance, or if you like these three: fresh attempts—attempts to create constant links with real industry—that is one step; the second is utilisation of local industrial establishments by the excursion method; and the third is the setting up of school workshops. It is evident that these are the lines along which we must progress towards making our school a labour school, and we are now progressing along them. Indeed, the experience of Petrograd, and Moscow, and of the provinces, shows us a whole series of individual successes in this field. It would be too optimistic to say that the whole body of the schools has taken this road, but neither are matters limited to a mere handful of good examples. Whatever town one might now visit, one can find a goodly number of schools which are combining these methods, relying mainly on one in some cases, another in others.

But at this point another difficulty raises its head—the lack of training among teachers for this kind of work. The labour school (both the rural school orientated on agronomy, the predominant type of school here in Russia, and the industrially-orientated school) presupposes new teaching skills: not only some acquaintance with technology itself, but the ability to use technology, to make educational use of the factory, and so on. The teacher must be able to bring out a whole number of educationally useful features and phenomena in the course of the labour process. This is such a difficult business that the natural world offers us few specimens of teachers with real virtuosity in it, or even with the ability to handle it with reasonable skill, and our “poor, bare Russian landscape” offers even fewer. People of this sort can be counted only in ones or twos, and they must be used not so much as actual teachers in the classroom as for providing “nursery gardens” to rear such teachers, as heads

of model pedagogical establishments. Even for such a purpose we have a comparatively small number of suitable people.

When some of our comrades, in respected Soviet publications, raised an outcry about the Commissariat for Education failing to notice the fact that teachers too have to be taught, this was a fairly fruitless exercise. For what do we need in order to produce teachers? Two things—1) that people should be eager to enter teacher-training institutes; 2) that those doing so should not be those who can find nowhere else to go, but the real, militant vanguard of our youth, young people who understand that the teacher's place in life is something sacred, a place of the greatest honour!

But we know that the teacher's actual position is grim. Even now he is still deprived of that share of social respect which should surround him, and deprived too of normal living conditions to make his working lot even remotely satisfactory. And in fact the inflow of new recruits is very weak. At this moment, in reply to the grotesque, entirely exaggerated figure given by the Central Board for Social Education (Sotsvos) ¹¹ as to the number of teachers required (250 thousand—this is some derangement of the imagination)—in response to this astronomical figure we point to the fact that we can train one thousand teachers per annum for the whole of Russia, which has now, even at this time of greatest crisis, not less than 45 thousand schools, taking only those of the first stage. Clearly this number of trainees is barely sufficient to replace losses from natural mortality. So, we have a very weak inflow; on top of this we hereby announce that it is also weak in quality.

At the Young Communist League congress it was said that in the schools there are too many young ladies. I do not consider this very damaging, since a woman teacher is no less capable of being a good teacher, but what kind of young ladies we have—that is the question. The standards of the teaching profession in general need to be raised. We have weakened them. In spite of all the power of attraction in the very idea of educating, in spite of all the immensity of importance that attaches to the role of the teacher, we have weakened the position of the teacher, and part of the blame for this lies with the teaching profession itself (and

its Moscow section not less than any other), which over a long period provoked misunderstanding between itself and the proletariat. This too is a word that cannot be left out of the song.*

The training of the teacher, then, is also an immense business, and we also have to find the trainers themselves, to seek them out and collect them up. They exist, but only in small numbers. And since they are the salt of the earth, they should not be left to hide their light under a bushel, but must be raised up on high. If this salt is not of very high quality, danger threatens us. We must cry out in a loud voice, not without a note of desperation in it: "Come, you who understand what the labour school means; come with both your hands and all your brain to meet this need, and be assured that the Soviet government, and the Commissariat for Education in particular, will value you at your weight in gold." I make that as a serious promise.

As we are to make a report at the Congress of Soviets, we shall be putting up a fight there for the teacher, and it will be a hard fight.¹² That the state can find resources for mass wage payments only with great difficulty, that is something we understand, but that the state should find it impossible to pay high specialist rates to the few score or maybe hundreds whom we now need to summon to perform highly qualified pedagogical work—that is not true. It can be done, and what is needed here is only a final tightening-up of the ties between the progressive social educationist and the specifically Soviet educationist—ties which are already being formed, I may say, which are every day growing stronger and more numerous.

That relates to the unified school of normal type. But there is also the "supernormal" school, though this too has its faults. If it is incorrect to pose the question of the proletariat having something like a monopoly of education, it is still more incorrect, monstrously incorrect, for proletarian youth to be almost outside the field of vision, almost outside the care and attention of the Committees for Social Education and for Technical Education (*Sotsvos* and *Profobr*).

*i.e., a factor that cannot be left out of the reckoning—there is a Russian proverb which says, "You cannot miss one word out of the song".—*Tr.*

And here one must stress the great debt we owe to the Young Communist League for not only obliging us theoretically to concentrate attention on young people in the factories and to increase the provision made for them, but for actually doing something about this itself, and for producing results here which in quality also come close to being the most heart-warming achievement of the recent period.

In the Russian Federation alone, not including the Ukraine and the Caucasus, we have now for some time had at our disposal a system of over 500 Factory Training Schools ¹³ (*fabzavuch*) for adolescents, providing for 50 thousand youngsters, and the numbers are going up all the time. Even if there is much that is organisationally unsatisfactory here, none the less this organisation is comparatively good thanks to the support of the trade unions and of the Supreme Council for the National Economy. Here too there are not enough teachers. But here the technical staff of the factories and mills often act as teachers, even though they have not any specifically educational skills. And here one of the happiest omens for the future to be seen anywhere are the courses for instructors now taking place in the former Empress Catherine Institute, training these new teachers. ¹⁴ Here we have a centre from which this truly noble work for labour education will spread outwards to all other schools.

And the aims of labour education cannot fail to come up here, not because the factory is engulfing these youngsters in its embrace, in its iron grip, seeking to exploit them—on the contrary, the educational community, the Communist Party, and the Young Communist League are exerting great efforts to provide maximum labour protection and attention to the educational aspect in these schools. Here it is an impossibility to lean too far towards what has been called the literary approach to education. Rather the contrary is possible—too great concessions on the side of getting work done, and this is something to be resisted. It would seem that the thing which is most lacking in the unified labour school—organised contact with the factory—is here too firmly established. This is why attention should be concentrated on the Factory Training School, so that we can take into account the experience being built up there, for as far as the labour school is concerned this is of course our vanguard detachment.

Now I must say a few words about higher education, about its significance in the educational scheme of the proletarian state, and in general about this thing that is often referred to as a cultural luxury. I repeat yet once more: this is not the proletarian nor the Marxist point of view; it is a regurgitation of the harmful ideas of populism, when people say, "Take care of those at the bottom first of all." For one cannot take care of those at the bottom if we have no strong top.

One cannot take care of the pupils without taking care of the teacher. This is like saying, when building up an army, "Why bother about officers, let us worry about raising up the soldiers." This is stupid. However democratic we may be, we know very well that in battle you need officers, that they need training, that at the head of an army there must necessarily be a centralised, powerful organ of thought and will, from which a whole mass of transmitting links reaches out to the executive apparatus, to the immense mass of rank and file soldiers. There will come a time when there will be no difference between the country's intelligentsia and its working masses. But it would have been sheer utopianism if V. I. Lenin had said not that we should replace the majority of the old civil servants, but that we did not need any civil service at all—what for? we are all well enough educated ourselves. But we are so far only reaching out to education.

Herein lies the impracticality of even the best anarchists, when they do not accept the transitional period leading to Communism. The Communist Party never plays for popularity with "democratic" ideas of the wrong sort, it does not say, "Let us get dissolved in the masses", but that it leads the masses. In those cases when the masses are disorientated we go against their current, using all means of energetic action upon them to oblige them to move in the right direction. But in this respect the Communist Party, while seeking to do away with aristocracy of any sort whatever, is in practice, and according to V. I. Lenin's formulation, the most disciplined of all workers' parties.¹⁵

In exactly the same way we must forge for ourselves, in the dimension of the state, a steel-hard intelligentsia that will cast utterly aside all the flabbiness of the Rudins and

Oblomovs, * that will be capable of operating as the stratum that gives state leadership. We have need of this, and we cannot accept illiteracy as a point of departure. All this is profoundly important, colossally important, and "let this not be forgotten, but taken into observance".¹⁶

We cannot separate one thing off from another: either we increase the flow upwards, to the top, of real people from the masses below, or those below will get no help and will stay down where they are. This is why the question of higher education is also a democratic question. It is with deep rejoicing that I welcome the fact that now, in response to the movement from out the depths of the people, the Communist Party is also taking a great step forward, recognising that one of its prime tasks is to get in among these young people, not to let them become disillusioned, to give them education; there can indeed be no more important and fruitful way to this end than the use of political education.

Among the mass of the peasantry political education is extremely important, just as the acquisition of literacy is. These things are dispersed throughout this enormous mass, we need them, but there is not enough of them. Here we have them in concentration, in the persons of these people who are coming up from below, coming from the villages and the factories out there, coming with a colossal thirst for knowledge; they can truly serve later in bringing enlightenment to the masses, whom we cannot enlighten without the help of this transmitting link. Thus it is a matter of importance to us to support these youngsters from the people, to turn them into young people capable of studying at university.

We have examples of this happening. Undoubtedly the Workers' Faculties are proving their worth. A little while ago I was greatly saddened to read of the death of Professor Zernov. Professor Zernov was if anything our political enemy rather than our friend, but he was an enemy of a kind it is good to meet: a man of real breadth of mind, of exceptional tact, who was able to appreciate what was good in our work, and who in all his dealings with us cooperated not only loyally but exceptionally helpfully, although he

*Characters from classical Russian literature, epitomising indecision and flabbiness.—*Tr.*

maintained a position of constant sceptical opposition, condemned a great deal of what was done, shook his head over it and never "yielded" his full independence. A few days before his death, after he had taken the chair at a meeting of the Examining Commission testing graduates from the Leningrad Workers' Faculty who were hoping to enter technical school, he declared that they were not only better qualified than all the other applicants, but in general very well qualified. He said one could only rejoice to see the endurance, the perseverance and the talent they displayed.

Though it may not be everywhere true that the level attained is high enough to cause a gray-haired preceptor to give his blessing to the young people before going to his grave, and to say that they are well enough qualified to take affairs into their hands, still it must be admitted that the level of training achieved is unexpectedly high. At the present time we have an intake of three and a half thousand former students of Workers' Faculties entering places of higher education, and next year there will be eight thousand; the total number of places in higher education is thirty thousand. As you see, this is already almost one-third of the total.

Another source from which places of higher education frequently receive entrants directly are the Party schools. Here we have 30 thousand young people, members of the Communist Party, studying extremely intensively and with ever-increasing success, to fit themselves to take up posts in the middle ranks, and later in the higher ranks also, of our state system. Here there is a whole number of things to observe that cannot but rejoice our hearts, that against the general background of disintegration in the school system (I am not speaking here of the lack of material things, common to all, about what is called the "material basis") cannot but give us great joy. This is a column advancing towards higher education.

On this point, the Rector of Sverdlovsk University has told me that this year the Examining Commission for entry registered even better results than before, and they had never been low enough to cause concern. These young people, he says, have somehow, goodness knows how, found the time to learn everything, they are quite good, thinking Marxists. And do you know what it means for a Communist

to say that these are quite good Marxists? It means a great deal. This is a matter of a whole world outlook. And when did they find the time to learn? Out there, serving in their Red Army, lying in the trenches, travelling through a dozen different provinces entrusted with various commissions, working in posts of social responsibility, they found time to learn all this. And when today we see such a phenomenon as this: that 30 thousand copies of a book such as a work by V. I. Lenin were bought up within a few weeks, and another print is needed—then the question arises: who is reading such books? The old intelligentsia? Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, now retired, who have a lot of time on their hands? I do not think so! It is the young people who are reading. And they read tens of thousands of copies of Marxist literature, read them until they are worn into holes.

Now, regarding present arrangements for entry to places of higher education. I know very well that many mistakes have been made here. I shall give one example to show the kind of mistake that can be expected here.

Take, for instance, the higher school for the arts. I think it is necessary to take this example because it brings the point out in especially sharp relief. I am told this kind of thing: that a number of students have been accepted for the Moscow Conservatoire whose level of talent and ability could not be put higher than two and a half.* And why? Because they were recommended by organisations. If this is to go on, it is nothing short of a crime against the state. Make him into a bad singer? Someone like that should be taken aside and told, "You have no training and no talent, you should be serving the people in these hard revolutionary times—and instead of that you are going to sing, with a voice like a goat?" I would be happier to see a counter-revolutionary, so long as he had a good voice, getting into the Conservatoire.

And in allocating grants the same sort of thing happens. He hasn't much ability, but his social background is good. It happens any number of times.

Clearly this is a profound mistake. First place should go to those who are indeed proletarian in origin, in way of

*In Russia, marking is made out of five.—*Tr.*

thought and in their whole character, and who have talent; second place to those who just have talent; and there should be no third place in such establishments of learning.

Now let us see how this point of view is applied to other places of education. Of course, if we applied it too broadly to other educational establishments, we should be making an immense mistake: a good specialist can determine straight away whether you have musical talent or not, there mistakes are practically impossible, but here the situation is quite different, here one must take into account not only the degree of qualification present, but also the fact that the vast majority of these young people have not had any chance to make themselves qualified. If we set up filtering apparatus that is too strict and heavy, we could completely cut off any penetration of proletarian entrants into higher education. Here we must bear in mind their immense drive, their perseverance, their ability to progress. They may be insufficiently qualified on the intellectual level, but their social experience and their energy is so enormous that they will find it easy to catch up. Here the social criterion can be fully brought into play.

All things considered, from this year forward we can welcome, alongside our victories on the fighting fronts, where we have brought the war to a close, alongside various diplomatic victories and some victories in the fields of industry and agriculture—we can welcome a great victory on the educational front as well. We now have a student body exceptionally dedicated to the revolution, that is enthusiastic, able, avid for learning—a new, uncommonly appealing type of student. I have had sufficient contact with them already to allow me to speak of this with full confidence. This victory we must now build on, and here questions of the material basis again come to the fore. One could subject these young folk to such trials that they will fall prey to disillusion. We are taking people out of their jobs (for they have all been carrying out one kind of Soviet work or another)—we take them out of their jobs in order to have them study, and we must give them the chance to study. This calls for fairly considerable expenditure, and this is one of the problems we have to raise in all seriousness.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOL AND THE REVOLUTION *

I wish to present for the attention of my listeners here some of the most important ideas embodied in the principles of our educational policy.

A year ago I might perhaps not have had the heart to make a theoretical speech dealing with general principles, treating to some extent the philosophy of the school, for it is only in the very recent period that we have begun to see that perceptible improvement on the "third front" as we call it, which has inspired in us the confidence to feel it possible to turn again to those immensely important cultural problems which the Russian people has set itself to solve, through its People's Commissariat for Education. While we were having to struggle—and it has been something of a fruitless struggle—with danger that threatened the very existence of schools, it seemed in the highest degree foolish to talk about any ideal forms of school, or even about transitional forms on the way to the ideal. Today this is not so: at the present time the Commissariat (to be precise the Scientific-Pedagogical Section of the State Academic Council (GUS) ¹ is busy working on curricula and methodological questions, that is on the construction of the temporary bridge which will allow us over the next few years to move in the direction of the unified labour school and of the whole school system determined by the central features of this school model.

We know that in the localities, almost everywhere without exception, questions of teaching methods, and of the principles to be followed in the education of children, have once more come to the forefront, more or less.

It is these facts, these clear signs of the opening up of active work in the fields of educational theory and school policy, that have moved me to give an address devoted to the fundamentals of our policy for the schools.

*Slightly abridged.—*Ed.*

Very frequently, during the first years following the Revolution, teachers of second-stage schools and in higher education, the professors, flung this reproach at us: you want to permeate the schools with class feeling, you want to make even little children the objects of your propaganda and agitation, you are tampering with objective classless education for the younger age-groups and with Great, Objective Science (not forgetting the capital letters) in the case of students at technical colleges and universities; you are tendentious people, you are people with a particular political partisanship, and you want to introduce that terrible thing, a party attitude, into the sacred business of educating the young, which must be entirely objective and to which political partisanship is quite alien.

A great many people, maybe, still share this point of view today; it bears witness to how little scientific education a teacher has had, if he can use such language. This does not mean in the least that I make this a reproach to him: I know that if the Russian teacher is not so very well qualified, that is not his fault. Even professors are poorly qualified in this sense, and not only histologists etc., (they do not work in the area of sociological issues, one cannot expect too much of them here)—even professors of sociology, of law, of education, even they are capable of saying such absurd and uninformed things. And this means that if a teacher himself, even a professor, who has gone through the whole educational process maybe from nursery school right through to the chair of a university department has still not learned the simple truth that the school has always been and cannot help but be a class weapon; if he himself, being a teacher and putting certain definite trends into practice, has still had as little suspicion that he was acting as the bearer of definite political tendencies as Molière's hero had that he had been speaking prose all his life²—then that is clear evidence of how wrongly the schools have been organised, if a man knows nothing either of himself or of his own functions, or of the truths by which he lives.

What is education, in essence, and what forms does it assume, what role does it play in the course of cultural history? They talk about this in such terms that the result is complete distortion of the truth, which is dimly visible as

through a fog. A student teacher just completing his course at a specialised training establishment does not know the history of education and the import of that history, the very essence of things is for him hidden by falsehoods both consciously and unconsciously purveyed, and it is these falsehoods that I shall attempt to uncover in the first part of my lecture today, to the best of my ability.

What are, in general, the aims of education?

The history of man from his earliest years, from the very first stages of his development, from the times when we first find him observable by historical and ethnological research, leads us to note the great part played by education. In the animal kingdom we often see as miraculous facts such as these: a creature that has, say, been isolated and artificially reared, that has never known its parents, will when it reaches maturity build a nest or spin a cobweb, and so on, with such skill that it is hard to know how it was acquired. But we do know how it was acquired: it is something innately proper to the given organism—bird, spider or beetle—just as it is proper to a clock mechanism to go and to tell the time, so long of course as the mechanism is not damaged. We know that in essence there lies concealed in the structure of organs and nervous system an accumulated “materialised experience”, which in answer to a particular natural stimulus makes a tiny creature respond without fail, always in the same precise and complex way. Over innumerable years this experience accumulates, through the death of those creatures that had not made the right adjustment and the reinforcement of correct adjustment when it occurred, through the anatomical or physiological change of organs and tissues in pursuance of a particular function. Thus it comes about that a beetle or a caterpillar knows what it has to do so that larva or butterfly will find itself in a favourable environment, knows what will be needed for another creature quite different from itself in all its ways. Just as we are not surprised that a baby does not need to learn anything in order for its heart to beat and its stomach to digest the milk it sucks, so we should not be surprised that an animal functions almost all its life on this experience acquired by inheritance, which does not presuppose a conscious process, or presupposes very little of such.

Man differs profoundly from this pattern. We see as enormous the difference between a little black child in Central Africa and the son of a professor in London: the development of language and thought is quite different, the accepted codes of life are different, there is an immense new process of adjustment to life, a colossal quantity of social connections within an unusually complex society, for the Englishman, while all this is very primitive, simple, half-animal, for the savage. Yet we are well aware that if the little Englishman, complete with all his instincts inherited from a long dynasty of English professors and cultural figures, were to be transported to Africa and brought up there from his earliest days, he would probably be distinguished from the small black child by practically nothing, or by absolutely nothing, or maybe there would be just a tiny difference—he would maybe less well fitted physically for that environment. And conversely, despite all malicious assertions that the “lower” races of humanity cannot be raised by education to a higher level of development, we know that this is a lie, that the difference between a child of average ability belonging to a backward nomadic people and some aristocratic sprig is absolutely nil. If the two are brought up in the same home, educated in the same school, then only individual abilities will decide who goes further.

Man as we take him, as we are considering him, is almost entirely created by education. From mother and father he has inherited what is called (again, of course, mistakenly) *tabula rasa*—an empty page: on this is inscribed all that is common to humanity as a whole, a whole mass of organic functions proper to man as a particular genus among the animals; but what he will believe in, what he will know, what he will possess—90 per cent of the content of his personality—will depend on education. And the degree of culture of each people is determined precisely by the extent, the degree of elaboration and the fitness to its conditions of life of the collective experience, accumulated from generation to generation, which is transmitted by means of education to succeeding generations.

Not as with the animals—the organism has itself changed, developed and now determines the fate of the young through direct heredity—but an immense experience at the highest stage of development, recorded in universities, lab-

oratories and libraries, in a colossal technological apparatus—that is what determines the degree of development of a small human boy or girl. And that little boy or girl (such an empty small being, such a small grub, in a highly developed society as much as in a less developed one) begins to be subjected to quite different external influences, and acquires artificially, through education, the collective experience that here is not fixed in nerves, muscles and bones, but is found in books, in knowledge, in instruments, in the wealth of modern society. This peculiarity of human society, that it fashions its fellow-citizen in its own image and likeness, out of the small human being, by means of suggestion, by communicating to him its customs, its knowledge, its ideals—this peculiar feature is education, and it is so singularly proper to man alone that one could add to the definitions *homo sapiens* (thinking man) and *homo faber* (man the toolmaker) another one—*homo educatus*, or educated man, man who is educated.

Just as for one order of animals, the mammals, one feature—the fact that in their early stage of development the young are fed on milk from the mother—has been taken as definitive, so for man the defining feature is that through language, through a complex system of signs, society educates and raises to its own level a completely helpless being. But just because education or upbringing is a procedure which has two elements in it—the element of ceaseless growth in the organisation of human experience, known as progress; and the skill of bringing children in to each stage of this progress by their assimilation of the experience built up over thousands of years—this very fact, this characteristic of education obliges us to reach the conclusion that it never was and could never be objective, it always was and had to be distorted by class prejudices and class tendencies.

Why? Because we see no healthy society throughout the whole history of humanity. We can distinguish in some cases a faint approximation to a more or less healthy society, but in the vast majority of cases we see nothing of the sort. We know little of the more or less primeval communist tribal group. And in the succeeding stages of development we see that war, hunting, and the subordination of poor tillers of the land to rich owners of the land are stratifying society into those that have and those that have not, into rich and

poor, noble and ignoble, those with knowledge and those without it. And do not think that this means that from that time on social experience will not be inculcated into the poor, that it will be used only by the upper classes. But experience, knowledge, education do become a privilege of the rulers, and that is only a small part of the evil inherent in education at this stage.

That is not all that is done: the little aristocrat, the little privileged person is poisoned by his awareness that he is something special, that he is descended from gods, that he has blue blood, that he is a noble, a warrior, that others must serve him, that the life of other people is nothing when set against his interests or even his caprices. From the very beginning he is reared to be the young beast, acting with violence and with pride towards others. From the very beginning he is told that it is right to bear the sword, that he is a nobleman, he is a soldier, a professional murderer—that is an especial honour, for such are the gods, such were his uncommonly noble ancestors; the gods were murderers too, and you are a murderer, you have the right to set your foot on the heads of others.

For such an aristocrat the whole of his education will be tailored to correspond to this, all the sciences will be taught him in this spirit. Any truth which might cause the small aristocrat to have doubts of his right to act in such a way will be taken out of circulation as unsuitable educationally, as inappropriate for a "noble" child, or it will be distorted, as we know that Christianity is often distorted at later, higher stages. Christianity, after all, is essentially a complete denial of all noble rank, of all noble birth, of any war, of any vengeful feeling. But we all know that our former officers and nobility were taught Christianity, they were told that the Son of God himself said, "Unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other." But if those officers had done that, they would have been drummed out of their regiments. On the contrary, anyone who insulted them in such a way must be challenged to a duel and killed—that was part of their code of honour. And it was the job of the priest, or the Jesuit, or any other accommodating cleric, to find some ingenious loophole and say that one must understand what the Son of God said in a spiritual sense, that it is not to be applied in everyday life.

But surely the message of the New Testament, which came into being among the lower classes, is imbued with a feeling of brotherhood and equality? True, it is quite without any feeling for struggle, it adjures us mystically to wait for help from above, it fosters passivity and patience among the lower orders—and this is a terrible shortcoming—but it is none the less a doctrine which was born among those of low degree, it bears their stamp. In order to trick the lower orders and keep them for ever patient, the ruling classes declared it, Christianity, to be the ruling faith, declared themselves to be soldiers of Christ and kings to be the Lord's anointed. Does this mean that they therefore changed the spirit of their schooling? It was all left as a matter of words only, and is one more proof of what I have been saying.

Education is tailored so that the aristocrat (and the same goes for the bourgeois) can develop to the full his class identity, his pride, his sense of honour, his thirst for bloodshed, his administrative talent as a slave-owner. And only that educator is approved who can develop all that in the child.

The lower down the social scale we go, the more the school changes. The ruling classes demand that those who find their way into schools for the common people should be educated in a spirit of submission, in a non-critical attitude to the society in which they live. An aid here is the pseudo-patriotic government-approved teaching of history, and another is the teaching of Scripture, which gives a perverted portrayal of the whole of Nature, and through which, with the help of a few fantastical ideas, one can disguise just enough to get by the absurdities which otherwise would be glaringly obvious to each of the humbled and the oppressed. Discipline is brought into the schools, and teaches the child to think from his earliest youth that he is a creature without a will of his own, that he is allowed to do practically nothing that he would like to do, that he is a small Other Rank with a non-commissioned officer over him, there to drill him, that he will be the human material with which the state performs its functions, that he is there to be fleeced.

If one were to look at the schools in any country you like, not through the dark glasses of one's own inner, decep-

tive illusions, but with one's real eyes, it would at once be apparent, standing out as it were in bold type, that these schools are institutions in which a particular state power trains each social class to perform those tricks, politically speaking, which it requires. The child from the upper classes is taught its tricks, the middle and the lowest classes in society are taught theirs, and science, knowledge and skill are only taught in that proportion to each which is essential for the state, to provide efficient workers knowing their job, but always taking care not to go too far, since you don't want that same science, full of the pride of Lucifer and of a stiff-necked, critical spirit, to be leading the children on to be too clever, and to lose the Molchalin * attitude, so pleasing and necessary to a class society.

That is what the schools are like everywhere. You can of course object and tell me, "No, not everywhere. We remember our Russian universities in the darkness of absolutist rule by the tsars. The University of Moscow, now, protested against schools being like that. There used to be some good teachers in the high schools, in the Cadet Corps, who put across other ideas. There were good village teachers, who did not want to be gendarmes at the blackboard, as it were, under obligation to clip the child's wings and turn it into a domestic fowl rather than a man."

Of course there were some who were different, I will say the same, there were. But this is no contradiction. Let us take the most striking example—that the universities, a considerable part of the teaching staff there and an even greater proportion of the students, over many decades were a bastion of struggle against absolutism. Why was this so? Because at that period the struggle was beginning between two classes—the land-owning class, supported by the higher clergy, the power of the army officers, and the administrative apparatus of petty officialdom run by the government, which wanted at all costs to keep Russia in a state of darkness, backwardness and frozen winter; and on the other side, the bourgeoisie, which was beginning to amass considerable resources, which needed railways, steamboat lines, telegraphic communications, well-organised medical

* A character from classical Russian literature epitomising obsequious obedience.—*Tr.*

services, exploitation of natural wealth, engineers, doctors, etc.—the whole cultural environment outside which capitalism cannot develop, outside which profits cannot be made. On this ground conflict arose at once between the old and the new.

Even Peter the Great was in part a bourgeois revolutionary, inasmuch as he became convinced that the nobility alone was an insufficient prop to rely on, and inasmuch as he saw the necessity of educating the broad social strata: he felt able to make a former errand-boy a Minister, he looked with favour on wandering foreigners of bourgeois origin—Dutch skippers and Swiss artisans, setting them in high positions. Insofar as it was in line with the Europeanisation of Russia, Peter sought to give scope to mercantilism, to merchant capital and the first beginning of industrial capital. The old nobility said, "What kind of a Tsar is this, this is a dock-tailed tsar, who chops off our beards—he's not ours." This happened because government was obliged to take the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, and from that bourgeois standpoint to start fighting the ingrained conservatism of the class on which it had up till then relied.

And that was the origin of the Russian universities. It was a matter of necessity to draw in the middle elements, to take their children to be taught everything the state needed when its neighbours were countries with highly-developed capitalism. And the result was a long-drawn-out conflict within society. The bourgeoisie, along with the intelligentsia that had itself been called into life by the bourgeoisie—the lawyers, engineers and so on—demands schooling of another kind: more of the objective sciences, more natural science, technology, less of the barrack-room approach.

It is an entirely natural collision: one sees in sharp relief the good businessman, the factory-owner, the banker, the railway builder. He says unequivocally, "What use is it to me, dammit, for my boy or girl to be buried alive in dead Latin, why should they be smothered with senseless Scripture, which is the faith of the past, which doesn't fit in with a modern view of the world? You teach him, make a man of him, in a real, modern school." (That is why in Germany those schools where the bourgeois spirit was stronger were given the name "real" schools, and this name later came into use here too.) "Teach him about real things,

give him qualifications, the knowledge he needs to become a trader, or a sailor, or a builder—that's the sort of man I need." But absolutism said, "I need a civil servant who will say 'Yes sir', 'If you please, sir', I need a man who will wear uniform; I cannot give way to you as easily as that; you make yourself very busy with those students, but students turn out revolutionaries."

A little analogy, to help you understand why such a collision as this can take place between the land-owning and bureaucratic interest and the bourgeois interest. Take the army. Up to the time of the imperialist war it was held that a soldier could be trained in two, or maybe three, years; France switched from a two-year to a three-year period, (otherwise, they say, you cannot get a good soldier). After the war all the generals who have dealt with this question—French, American, and German—all admitted that one can produce an excellent soldier in four months. Drill is not necessary. Barrack-square manoeuvres, all the military service and military drill that used to be carried to such lengths, that was still haunted by the ghost of Frederick the Great of Prussia, all goose-stepping with your boot-toes up to nose level—all that is nonsense, useless clap-trap. The business of killing people with poison gas and artillery has nothing to do with barrack-square drill.

So do you think the generals were just fools, that they did not understand this earlier on? They understood perfectly well that it was technically speaking, idiotic to waste the time of large numbers of people in that way. They were being taught not what was needed in wartime, in reality, and they were not being taught the right way either. So for what purpose were they being taught? In order to get soldiers who had been cowed and hypnotised. The barracks is a place which makes it possible to induce in a man such an inner state that he, the soldier, will without hesitation fire on his own father or mother, if required. The need is to stupefy men, to turn them into automata, numbskulls—and then they will do as they are ordered with no pang of conscience. To reduce a man to that kind of state, three years of barrack-square drill were indeed needed.

Exactly the same thing is true of the classical high school (gymnasia): eight years of drill were needed, in order to produce one of the most monstrous phenomena of European

—and Chinese—life: the official or civil servant. And a greater or lesser number of living human beings were turned into automata, their living souls done to death and only their bodies left alive. This was a quite definite line of policy.

The bourgeoisie saw schooling quite differently. It fought for the “real” or modern school. And this was at a time when the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia were in leg-irons, when Russian absolutism viewed them with the greatest distrust, when the Ministry of Education was a Ministry of De-education, when it had been given its orders of the kind “Now you watch it, the common folk are not to be educated any too far”, when the main aim was “The Provincial Councils (*zemstvo*) want to provide education, do they?—Forbid it!” and “Free thought is stirring, you say?—Send in the priests, to see what’s going on there in the schools!”

When this sort of thing was going on, the liberal-bourgeois schools became riddled with a feeling of opposition, of a sort, and this is the reason why it appears as though this liberal-school-in-opposition was standing in defence of something of importance to all men, something that every teacher needed to know. You will tell me, “Of course, I understand that the Ministry of Education as it was then wanted to drill people into submission, but there were, after all, schools of a different kind—the private schools, the *zemstvo* schools: ³ they did not want this, they wanted to educate real people, independent people.” Let’s have a closer look.

I have to warn you straight away that I am speaking of the mass school; I am not speaking of the exceptions, about which I shall have something to say later. Let us consider how the bourgeoisie has organised its very own schools. There is only one country where the bourgeoisie has organised its own schools more or less freely from start to finish, a genuine school of the bourgeoisie—and that is America. I will at once make a proviso here, that there is one more interesting type of school—to some extent the Swiss model, and further the Norwegian school; the latter is a school of petty-bourgeois/peasant type, it has features all its own, which are class features in a quite individual way.

But we are going to speak of the bourgeois school as such. The bourgeoisie in France and in Germany have been unable to organise their own kind of schools. To illustrate the extent to which they did not dare to do so, I will quote two examples.

The bourgeoisie took a realistic approach, it said: one must not clutter up children's minds with superstitions, one must not teach them things that from a scientific point of view are clearly lies; one must teach them to know the real truth about nature, so that the end product, broadly speaking, will be a good engineer, a man able to deal with nature in the area in which he will be set to work; we need a real contest with nature, the development of industry, of commerce, of agriculture. And so the bourgeois teacher ejected the priest from the school; the bourgeois teachers said, "We do not want the priests, you can teach religion as you teach myths and literature, that these are myths arising at a particular stage of development, but you cannot teach it as being the truth."

This attitude was expressed with outstanding clarity quite recently, a few years ago, by one of the greatest German educationists, Paulsen, who advances a very characteristic argument, one that places matters in such sharp relief that it will reveal the nature of the bourgeois school better than anything else: ⁴ "One cannot have Scripture taught in the schools because Bible history, and to a large extent the New Testament narratives, contradict the spirit of all else in the school. School must educate in the child a consciousness of the rule of law in all phenomena. What use is a school which has not given a child, by twelve years of age at least, an understanding that miracles do not happen? He has to grasp, as clearly as twice two is four, the laws that say matter is indestructible, that it moves through a cycle of energy, that nothing produces nothing—and in the next classroom Herr Pfarrer (the pastor) is going to be telling him about miracle. Whom will the child believe? He will say: 'Please explain how this or that miracle could happen, from the point of view of physics'; he will say: 'You are talking some strange nonsense! Why are you telling me that Jonah spent three days in the belly of a whale?—it doesn't fit in with what the teacher told us about whales in Nature Study!'

"This occurs because one teacher is teaching the science that was in force two thousand years ago, or a thousand years ago, or even with a stretch five hundred years ago, while another teacher is teaching science the way it exists today: its tail end still back in the views predominant among country folk, the most backward strata in society, who draw their mental nourishment from outdated notions. But the schools cannot be a party to that, it is the schools that have to lead children forward, out of that old view of the world—which means that there is no place for the clergy in them. If parents wish, let all that go on, outside the school; but what is said in school must be only the truth, confirmed by modern science—nothing else."

Paulsen goes further, and stresses the class nature of the thing. He says, "Do you not think that the small son of a proletarian, once he has ceased to believe that the world was created in seven days, and in other rubbish, will say in school: 'Why are you telling me such nonsense—the geography teacher disproves it himself'—and if he does not say it, that does not mean that he believes. And what happens if he ceases to believe anything, any of what he is taught about the laws of property, about the state order, all that is the law and the basis of our society? You are offering him something tenuous, easily destroyed by criticism, and later on he will not trust you in anything."

And in order to preserve the possibility of pouring into the souls of small proletarians and peasants, through education, the bourgeoisie's views on the world and on society, the bourgeoisie has thrown Scripture overboard, as a piglet is thrown to the wolves when they are catching up with your sledge. Goodbye Scripture—it's our weak side. Here you are then, Progress, take it and tear it apart, maybe we can manage to save the rest!

But I have already said that the bourgeoisie had not the courage to make their school "theirs" consistently, all the way. And in this respect the talented Foerster, an Austrian educationist who touches on the matter of the schools, has this to say: "Before the war our schools were in many ways wrongly ordered. We were filled with the spirit of liberal individualism, we thought that the state was something separate, a sort of night-watchman, while the important thing was to prepare a man for life. Meaning to give him sharp

teeth and long talons with which to fight for his own cultivation." ⁵

A marvellous critique from the mouth of one of the great teachers. You might meet a boy of 13 or 14 and ask him why he needed to pass his examination in physics. "So that I can go to university." "And why go to university?" "So that I can get a post." "And why do you need a post?" "So that I can have money and enjoy life, be a privileged person." Thus all knowledge becomes—teeth and claws. That boy is well-adjusted to the struggle for survival. So that I can get a post more easily, the school must help me to acquire, with the least possible effort, all the knowledge I shall need. Because I personally count on achieving this or that appellation in the Table of Ranks; like in the school for mandarins, where when you have mastered another branch of learning you get another button or tassel on your cap, and great honour and reward is yours. It is these "buttons and tassels" which are the exclusive aim of bourgeois study.

And what, says Foerster, was the result? The result was bad citizens. As it turned out, we survived, or half-survived, the last war. As it turned out, the instinct of the people still told them they should all die for Wilhelm II, for "great Germany". But things might have been far worse, and it is time to pause and think. Here we have the instinct of a bourgeois of the imperialist period, when the nations can no longer reach agreement peacefully, but have at every step to be at one another's throats, when the cry is "All for one!" Every firm—"great Germany" or "great Russia", has to be united from top to bottom, everyone must put the interests of the firm before his own. "Patriotism" is the feeling which makes a man devoted to a firm which gives its profits to a few capitalists and high officials only: the feeling that makes that man ready to sacrifice his personal interests, his family, his health, his life.

"Patriotic education" in this respect has an especially anti-human tendency... Because here "patriotism" is simply a call-up of subjects, irrespective of their faith or nationality, to bolster up one particular firm of brigands that has massed together as many people as possible.

Foerster says the child must be educated in the spirit of patriotism, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of social

unity, the spirit of collectivism—patriotic of course—and he asks himself: how can this be done in the bourgeois school? How shall we instil into the son of peasants or proletarians that he must sacrifice himself to the whole? Why, he will ask, should I sweat and suffer all my life through, and die in the same state, and for some reason be a patriot, while a few score thousand people in "my country" live in luxury?

Is it possible, Foerster asks, for the lower orders to love "their country" as it is today? No, he says, in the light of science it is not possible. If you give scientific development to a boy or girl from the lower strata, they will not love their country, they will be outraged by the order prevailing in it... The bourgeoisie has never been able to carry its kind of school through to the end, because a genuine school must be absolutely honest in its scientific aspect. To state all facts scientifically, as they are, to place problems before the child just as they are posed by the whole of life—that would mean setting the child against the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois system contradicts the progress of technology, the progress of science.

We do not need exploiters, bourgeois people. We need engineers, technologists, workers and peasants, we need the whole mass formation of people who carry through the great work of creation, and whose loss it is if someone is drawing a profit from it. A factory is a place where the struggle with nature proceeds, the struggle to change the face of nature to serve the human race—that is the socialist conception. Here we have a conjunction of human powers, a great assemblage of machines, the action of certain energies, the cooperation of certain people, world-wide links through the sending and receiving of raw materials, through the despatch of material now processed for use by man. But, it appears, this factory belongs to some "Titus, son of Titus", and all the surplus produced by it goes to him: he can stop the factory working if it is not profitable to him—if it brings no profit to him to produce boots, or cloth, or to introduce a new machine, seeing hands are cheap anyway.

And this fact, that they compete with one another, that they bring the world to war, in which all is brought to ruin and destruction and the earth crimsoned with blood—

this is what must be rooted out. From the point of view of technology and science all this is an outdated ossification, a survival from the past, a monstrous distortion of the human race and of our property relations. Science and labour strive to free themselves from this dead weight, pleading for human life to be organised on the basis of scientific truth, regardless of any rights and privileges. Could a bourgeois government allow the schools to say this? Never—not in France nor yet in America will any teacher say such a thing. A teacher or professor who did so would be thrown out at once. In America a man who dares to teach socialism in the lecture-room will be out within 24 hours, and we see a whole series of examples of this happening, let alone what takes place in other countries.

The school, then, cannot be honest under the bourgeoisie, it cannot be scientific under the bourgeoisie—just scientific up to a point, so far as learning is concerned. How can your bourgeois educate a child? He has just as much of an interest in discipline as the nobility had before him. Does he not need an army, does he not need people to break their backs with work in his factory?

The school which Communism brings with it is first of all a unified school, i.e. a school the same for all classes, applying the same methods of teaching for all. Ideally the school we want to have—one that offers all children, regardless of origin, the prospect of further development—makes no distinction as between "people's" schools (where you go through four classes and then get out, thank you very much) and schools for the rich—it is a really non-class school: boys and girls enter the preparatory class and complete their education with their last term in university. Opportunities are equal for all. And since the country is not yet able to take the whole child population through all stages, on that account it is the most able who are accepted for higher education.

Secondly, this is a labour school. A labour school, i.e. a school which has got rid as far as possible of learning-by-rote, which enables the child, exercising its abilities, to develop as far as is possible through play, gradually transforming this play into simple labour processes, then into more complex and fruitful ones yielding practical knowledge. It will draw the child all the more surely,

through giving him mental food via his own interests, into the sphere of practical knowledge and skills, since all has been apprehended by the external organs in the course of active work involving the entire organism.

In this respect the Americans have done what they could: they have no unified school and cannot have such, but so far as the labour school is concerned, in the matter of giving precedence to active methods of apprehension, a very great deal has been done by the Americans. Much can be learned from them at this present time, and we know how this method of education through work, through going outside the school, making drawings, having the child or a group of children work independently on a given theme, producing reports, having discussions, making models, acting themes out as drama, etc.—how this method gives acquired knowledge deep roots within the child, almost completely avoiding the danger of forgetting what has been learned, of relapses into ignorance, which has been a universal phenomenon with our old-style schools.

But this is not all that we understand by the labour school.

For the second-stage schools we have in mind not only teaching the various subjects through the active method of apprehension, with subsequent summing-up of the conclusions reached by means of talks and notes. Here we also have teaching of labour itself. This teaching of labour (as distinct from technical studies, where the object is merely to turn a human being into a good workman) we understand as part of general education. That is, it is not a matter of producing a good turner or a good textile worker, but of teaching someone what labour is.

Today's scientifically based agricultural or industrial labour is an entire, pure crystallisation of science. If you took a child and with him made a study of a factory, with its repair shop, its store, its internal discipline, its accounting system, what would you have been studying? You would at the same time have been studying all the laws of nature. You will encounter a million living examples of physics, chemistry etc., you will come upon the sciences that deal with living organisms, you will acquire an enormous mass of information on mathematics,

mechanics, on the practical processes of the given type of production, and so on.

We call our school "polytechnical", because we would wish labour to be studied not in one example only. In studying factory history, you study the development of labour relations, you find out what industrial diseases are, you encounter public health, anatomy, physiology—a whole group of medical sciences. There is no group or branch of knowledge which is not somehow woven into that gigantic conjunction of human and natural relations presented to us by a developed industrial centre, factory or mill. But great difficulties still await us, of course, along this way: to bring children right into work within mills and factories, for educational purposes, is at present not possible, we are obliged to limit ourselves to excursions, and that only in the places where there is a sufficient number of factories and mills. In a word, the question of turning the second-stage school into a true labour school is a very complicated one, and the curriculum which we are now recommending solves this question only by indicating substitute measures along these lines. This school, which Marx so longed for, is in fact possible today only for the children of the proletariat, and for those in the Apprentice Schools—for them, one can take advantage of their position as part of the labour force, and see that their labour has an educational aspect also. Such work is being developed most intensively, in the field of the Factory Training Schools (Fabzavuch).

But our school is not only a unified school, not only a labour school, not only a polytechnical school; these are the epithets which define it as a scientific or strictly as a teaching establishment. We have still the task of *education* proper: this can be discharged by means of the correct teaching of history and the science of society, and by means of correctly organised school life.

What object are we pursuing in this? We want to educate a human being as harmonious as possible morally and spiritually, one who has received a full general education and can easily acquire full skill in some particular field. We likewise have in mind the creation of a true, well-disposed fellow-worker to his fellow-citizens, we want to produce a comrade to all men and a fighter, so long as

the fight lasts, for the socialist ideal. The fact is that these tasks have been formulated long ago, at the times when the greatest clarity of educational thought was achieved, either during whole epochs or through the person of individual men of genius as educators.

In the book *Problems of People's Education* ⁶ I give an outline of how the Greek school (inasmuch as the Greek state was obliged to set itself the task of creating a fully qualified citizen) posed the problem of how to educate each Greek so that he should be on a much higher level of qualification than a barbarian—as a warrior, as a worker, and as a thinker. But this was not all, there was still the need to create the maximum possible solidarity among themselves. And all Greek legislation, all Greek culture and poetry had an educational object—to train up a fellow-citizen of uncommon perfection, strong in body and spirit, filled with great friendship and devotion to every other Greek. The significance of this education was that a Greek should thus be distinct among the family of other peoples, and distinct also from the slave, captured in war among the barbarians. Even religion itself was used for this purpose.

Let us take the educational significance of Greek sculpture. A boy sees a statue. "What does that mean?" he asks. He is told that such-and-such a one gained the victory—in running, wrestling, chariot-driving, poetry-reading or some other form of contest—at the great national examinations which the nation provided for all fellow-citizens—and because of that a monument has been put up to him, and the victor-athlete was rarely represented in a portrait likeness; the sculptor strove to create a general model, so that a boy should think, "So that is how one has to develop one's body, there is the model of what men honour, the pride of my town, and I too must try to be like that."

But Greek education was not limited to the athlete, above him was the hero, the half-god, and the god himself, the god of human form, more a man than was man himself. All Greek religion through its sculpture was saying: man is hindered from being truly a man, by illness, by suffering, and by death; if we imagine a man immortal (and "immortal" was the epithet most often applied to

the god), a man untouched by age, this is what he would be like; this is how his countenance would reflect the wisdom, the calm, the harmony of a being assured of himself, rational, and beautiful—all together.

Thus the staircase rose higher, up almost to the unattainable ideal, and everything was a call, making clear what heights were to be scaled, what goal reached by means of all the gymnastic exercises, theatrical spectacles, moving festivities, even the wars themselves, which also had an educational significance, since they furthered the civic object of defending from the barbarians the centre of the World—Greece. This is why one can find examples in the pedagogy of the ancient world.

At the time of the French Revolution we see how the progressive bourgeoisie, striving to draw in the popular masses to follow its lead, also begins to formulate the tasks of the school as the tasks of educating the most perfect possible man and citizen. In France there appear the school plans of Talleyrand, Lepeletier and Condorcet, which remain classics even today.⁷

But every sincere teacher can say, "I want to produce a person who will be happy and who will make others happy. But how can you expect me to do this when your society is imperfect, when it is cannibalistic, when it is torn by contradictions?" And it is only one step from here, a step which the majority of great teachers have made, to socialist or semi-socialist ideas.

A teacher, who looks at things from his own point of view, says, "Now if one could succeed in educating all people in the spirit of love, comradeship, solidarity, beauty of mind and body, then society itself would change. "But society does not allow this to be done, it keeps its wild-beast likeness. That is why the revolutionary starts from the other end, and in answer to the idealistic soaring flight of Greek pedagogy, or to the dreams and the practical work of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Fichte and Herbart,⁸ he says: "You, teacher, rightly pose the task of producing the person beautiful, the fellow-worker and comrade of others within the great fellowship of all men, but you will not be allowed to accomplish it. First of all it is necessary that I, the revolutionary, relying on the inward indignation of the masses, should clear the way

for you. And then, when I shall have shattered to bits the slave-owning state of the landowner and bourgeois type, shattered all these Ministries of De-education of the people, freed you from the power of the church, and told the truth to those of your kind who have ears to hear and who need to be liberated, because within them is a living teacher waiting—then you can set to work. This earthquake will bring many buildings down, the struggle will cause fights to the death among you, and bitter hardening of hearts, but still you cannot but sense that for you freedom has come.”

Education is a pouring, into new, clean human vessels unstained by vice, prejudice and egoism—into those small and enchanting beings that children are—a pouring into them of all the data (appropriate to their age) of our immense scientific knowledge, all the skills of our vast technology, all the beauties of our enormous artistic wealth with the object of bringing forth in them, through physical culture and mental exercise, a truly developed person, developed intentionally according to plan—the person you and I, teacher, once dreamed of, the person we ourselves could not become in our day, but whom you can now educate, because a proper social framework for doing so has been created.

You may glance out of the window and say, “Have we not still with us takers of bribes, men dizzy with power, hypocrites, the sick and the ignorant?” We have them all, because the path on which they proclaim, “Make men better and society will become better” is self-deception or most ingenious falsehood. That way must not be taken, so we have made society much better than men.

“Our Constitution, our ideals, are glorious, but in practice”—you may say to us—“in practice our life differs little from ordinary animal existence.” True, because man has not yet been re-educated. Re-education is necessary, sometimes through a severe purging of oneself and of others around one. We have to be freed from all the “opium” that was once poured into our veins, from all the egoism and dead weight of prejudices that handicap each one of us, and our generation must make immense efforts in order to bring itself little by little up to the level of the preliminary, preparatory educational work which

we are now carrying through. But we do this, in hopes that younger brothers and our sons who are now 15 or 16 years old will be better prepared, though not fully so. Our hopes rest on you, teacher, that you, despite the hard conditions prevailing, will be able to clear, or at least begin to clear, the great road forward so that in the future, under Communism, the stream of education may be cleansed from the taint of class, so that only the pure waters of science, art and truth may be poured into the souls of children, so that *for the first time ever* education may become classless—a thing not of class but of humanity, and so indeed communist.

Not every teacher by a long way will hearken to this. There are some who do not want to hear, who stuff their ears with cottonwool... At periods of history such as ours one cannot live without immense enthusiasm, without sacrifice. It is a very great time, and those whose legs are very short must try at least to stand on tiptoe.

But there are many who are so sunk in the old ways that they say, "And where are you going to re-educate me? My head is grey already, praise be. And they want me to teach the new way... What new way, when there aren't any textbooks to tell me? How am I to work it out for myself? I'm not used to that sort of thing..." That—in crude, caricatured form—is what many are indeed saying, to themselves and to others.

And there is the martyr teacher, who hears all this, responds to everything, and says, "I can't do it, I haven't the knowledge, I haven't the knack... I understand with all my soul what an awesome work I am called to do. I realise that it is I, the Russian teacher, who bears the responsibility for several generations of children whose happy, and dangerous, chance it was to be born at the time of turning, when the law of the jungle is ending and the true law, the human law is beginning, at the time of change, taking place in pain and struggle and for that reason all the more pregnant with risks of all sorts... Help me..."

And we, the Communists, who call him to this work, say that in this department our powers are small. We have been able to fasten together sloppy Russia, the Russia of the petty-bourgeois and the peasant, we have succeed-

ed in organising her into iron unity under the dictatorship of the proletariat. She has fought her way through, she is independent, she is deciding her own destiny, but we, the Party, can do no more alone: we must have a union of all forces, we must have deep cooperation of all the forces of labour.

It is time to cast aside all misunderstandings, all old accounts, all doubts. It is time to realise that the awesome upheaval has taken place, that we have emerged from the chrysalis, that soon we shall learn to fly, but for the moment we are blinded by the world that opens before us, and we are surrounded by a host of enemies: both within, by reason of a mass of elemental dangers, and without, in the person of the competitors and sworn foes who surround us. The hour of our great liberation is an hour of great danger, and we must draw together in single unity throughout the whole Union of Soviet Republics, mindful that this will draw to us the whole world of those who labour, and that gigantic majority will ensure our victory.

We must close our ranks. And when the Communist Party calls upon the teachers, it does so in a voice trembling with emotion, it understands how infinitely much it needs them, how all, absolutely all the work of building a socialist culture, of fighting ignorance which is the gangrene eating us away—all this depends on whether the teachers can, as we put it, re-adjust themselves, that is educate themselves to the realisation of the fact that they are the ones called on to organise, for the first time in history, a truly human school, and to finding the skill to do it.

In this sixth year of our common struggle we are already well on the way to a coming together of this kind, to a joint solution of the question. And if we have among us a third type of teacher—teachers who know which way to go, who are progressive people, who may make mistakes but who have firm ground under their feet, in the sense of having a good grasp of classical pedagogy and an understanding of American labour-school methods, and within them the concept of the unique situation of the Russian school in these matters—then such teachers should be valued not just at their weight in gold, but at their weight in I know not what: they are the yeast with

whose help we shall leaven all our lump and make it rise, for knowledge is a thing even more infectious than plague.

If proper use is made of a knowledgeable person, he or she can with remarkable speed, in the course not of decades but of a few years, enrich with knowledge a considerable mass of people, the knowledge passing from one to another. We have such people, however few they may be. There is an immense desire to learn. We have a new breed of young people, thirsting to help us, who are weak in knowledge but strong in spirit and in enthusiasm— young people studying in poverty-stricken training colleges, often poorly provided in respect of good teaching, but studying along the right lines, and filled with a high consciousness of the mission awaiting them and with readiness to make many sacrifices both during their time of study and thereafter, for all the sacrifices are repaid by the immense results the teacher's work yields.

I want to conclude this speech with some notable words said by a person I am in general not greatly in sympathy with, but who was a great reformer—Martin Luther. In an epistle to German teachers Luther says: "If I were not a preacher I would wish to be a teacher, for as a preacher I speak to people whose backs are bent and whose hands are horny, to people maimed and soiled by life, but you, the teachers, you speak to pure souls. The truth which I preach falls into a soul perverted, and there is itself sometimes perverted or lies and gives no growth: the truth which you bring to the receptive and pure soul of a child will there burn up as a bright flame."⁹

We might say the same thing, for if we were not agitators, called on to preach our truth to crippled adult souls since only they, men maimed, but with men's strength, can bring about the change that will be salvation to all men—otherwise each of us would find it sweet to address ourselves to that pure audience, to those fresh small hearts, to those bright, open little minds from which so terribly much can be made, from each one of which can be produced, given the right educational approach, a true miracle.

They used to maim the human race, they used to make a human being into a petty official or some other such

monster, but now we have to mold a child into a miracle, a real human being, such as was rare among us or among our fathers, but which must be found ever more frequently among our younger brothers and sisters, yet more frequently among our sons and daughters, and which will become the predominating type among our grandsons and granddaughters. This miracle is being wrought by the revolution, wrought by life, but without teachers it cannot be wrought. It is the one miracle that science can recognise—the transformation of the human race.

And every teacher, if he understands his mission aright, must, whenever he enters the classroom or any premises where children are playing, or takes children outdoors, to the lap of nature, feel that something solemn is taking place, something touching the heart with joy: they are living through the miracle of humanity's transformation. If they can comprehend what vast freedom of operation and creation will be theirs in this sacred calling, and how passionately the revolution calls them to do this, how ready it is, for all its poverty, to come to their aid with all speed; then surely they will with full hearts, in spite of all difficulties, speak their own word of deep gratitude to the revolutionary proletariat and to its leader, the Communist Party of Russia!

THE TASKS OF EDUCATION WITHIN THE SYSTEM OF SOVIET CONSTRUCTION *

The principal, fundamental and all-embracing task of Soviet power is to bring Communism into being. As members of the Comintern, as representatives of the international thought and the international struggle of the working class, we, the Russian Communist Party (RKP—*Rossiiskaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya*), whose will and whose thought determines the policy of the Soviet government—we of course seek the establishment of Communism throughout the world. But in particular Soviet power seeks the establishment of Communism within our Union, or more precisely seeks to follow within our Union that policy which will lead most rationally and most directly to the victory of working people throughout the world.

And in this our country finds herself placed in quite unique circumstances. On the one hand, it has outstripped all other countries as regards the road of political development, and in this respect she stands closer to Communism than all other countries, for she has in actual existence a Soviet government, a government of workers and peasants, behind which stands what is essentially a workers' Communist dictatorship. In no country of the world besides those belonging to our Union is there anything of the kind. But at the same time our country is, as regards the economy and as regards cultural matters, one of the most backward countries, and she remains so to this present time. She thus finds herself surrounded by a world hostile to her, and furthermore lagging behind the civilised nations of Europe and America. From this flows an agonising contradiction, which we have constantly to take into account.

We find ourselves in constant, though sometimes concealed, conflict with the governments of the rest of the

*Slightly abridged.—*Ed.*

world, and we realise only too well that the ground under our feet is very treacherous, as Lenin said—boggy ground, since under us is an immensely deep layer, which at present is what chiefly supports us economically, of small peasant economies that are very far from having reached a stage enabling them to grow sufficiently mature for a transition to Communism. And along with this, the cultural level of the country is in no sort of accord with the huge tasks that the October Revolution has set itself.

From this one can draw the following conclusion on the immediate aims which arise from the general goal of moving towards Communism: we have to defend ourselves, we have to organise the defence of the country. The first front is defence of the country. This first front has for a long time, as you know, loomed so large as to obscure all the other fronts. It was, in effect, the one and only front. It could not be otherwise, because in the first years after the Revolution our conflict with the bourgeoisie of the whole world became acute in the extreme, and we had to defend ourselves, arms in hand, in direct and open war.

Then, obviously, it was essential to bring the economy of the country into order, for a whole number of reasons: it was impossible to live at the level of poverty in which we did live in 1918 and 1919. The continuance of such poverty would of course have spelt death to the Revolution, for one thing; for another, only given development of the economy can we find ourselves sufficiently strong to put up some resistance to the onslaught of the bourgeoisie; and thirdly, because the higher the economy can raise itself, the stronger we shall prove as the main weapon of the world proletarian Internationale in its struggle—and not only that, the brighter, too, will shine the example we shall set, the more definitively we shall shatter into fragments the slanderous assertions of our enemies, assertions which give pause to the proletariat itself, when it is assured that the road which we have taken is the road to ruin. Our economic development will not only enable us to live like human beings ourselves, not only make us firmer fighters against our foes, it will also prove that the power of the worker, supported by the peasant, leads to the most beneficial results even in a country as backward as ours, even given the hostility of the whole

world towards her. And such a conclusion is stronger than any propaganda and agitation, to the whole of the West European proletariat and to the peasantry of the whole world.

The third front is what we have usually called our educational battle-line. And of course, comrades, no one actually produced a theory stating that defence had to come first, then the economy, and education in the third place —no one has advanced such a theory. But life itself obliged us willy-nilly to assess these tasks as having these placings in the perspective.

Why could no one have advanced such a theory? It is clear enough. Is it conceivable to wage a war without an economy? It is utterly obvious that an army can be fed, clothed, shod and armed only if there is an economy functioning at a certain level. Countries reduced to complete beggary can maintain no army whatsoever, and to maintain seven millions at fronts extending over eleven thousand kilometres is a colossal economic task. So the first front was inconceivable without the second. But the very nature of the second front was to some extent distorted, of course, during the years of the Civil War. Very little thought could be given to rational, planned development and very much had to be given to shock-tactic economics, to squeezing out somehow or other a certain quantity of goods, of food for the front, and to keeping going the railways which could be of strategic importance, and so on.

It goes without saying that the third front also was in the same state, but then how can one wage war without education? Of course one cannot. In the Civil War, education, like the economy, played an immense part. But where was it to be found, in what form was it expressed? It took the form of work in the army. That was the point where impact was concentrated: the work of enlightenment, the culture sections of the political departments, that enormous force, most of it Communist, which set its work in train in the innermost depths of that army of seven million in order to turn yesterday's deserter, yesterday's green peasant lad with no understanding of what it was all about, who said, "You promised peace but you've given us war"—in order to turn such men into the

Red Army soldiers who won victory on all the fronts of the Civil War.

In effect all three fronts were in operation, but they adjusted themselves to the first front, and it is only now, over the years just past, that we have been able to sort out in our minds, objectively and in a normal manner, the inter-relations between them. Now we can repeat—and not only we ourselves, the people of the third front, we can speak, in repeating it, in the name of the whole Soviet government—that the third front is inextricably intertwined with the first front and the second, that it is impossible to separate them, and that at the present time we are face to face with the following problem: that neither the defence of the country, nor the government of the state, nor the development of the economy, is conceivable without rapidly expanded work on the third front...

To train people for defence, train people for economic work, train people for posts of command in our state—this means *educating* true Communists who will be dedicated heart and soul to this work. And this too is an educational task, a work of enlightenment.

First of all, life itself plays an enormous part here. Insofar as the worker and the peasant begin to comprehend their situation, they begin to lose the feeling that they are slaves to their Father the Tsar, to lose their childish trust in the priest, or simply the inert feeling that you can't stop things happening anyway. In place of this there appears a real, genuine, active awareness of their own interest, a desire to make life relate closely to their own direct interests.

We cannot put our trust in life alone and say that all that is developing and happening is right. On the contrary, the essence and purpose of the existence of the Communist Party lies in discerning the direction in which life is moving, and in struggling with that which turns aside, to a false path, away from Communism. We give an active education, and this kind of education does not mean the propaganda of "morality", approved by the bourgeoisie as a way of propping up the crumbling walls of bourgeois education and bourgeois religion. Our education lies in bringing all stages of the educational structure closer to life. Life teaches, or not so much life itself as

the body of public opinion which has now become an integral part of life.

We must work to strengthen the links our young people have with reality, and this means developing links between reality and the Young Communist League (Komsomol), the daily lives of our children and of our institutions for children.

Every member of the Young Communist League has a deep pride in, and awareness of belonging to the League. He is proud of this League which is his very own and which also bears Lenin's name. For him, to belong to the League is the highest happiness; expel him from the League and he will in the majority of cases die, morally or physically.

The same applies to the children's movement. The small Pioneer, a thimble of a man, considers himself one of Lenin's pioneers and is proud to be a participant in revolutionary development. He is prouder of his red scarf than any general ever was of his St. Andrew's ribbon.

Even the best loved teacher cannot influence a boy or girl better than a good collective is able to. If a child is told by his comrades in the organisation that he is a bad Pioneer, the effect is colossal.

One of the foremost German educationists, Paul Natorp, in a book which he wrote before the war about the increasing incidence of vice and suicide among adolescents, said: "I have to state that the only method of combatting this has been found by the Social Democrats, for it is their youth organisations that have the best record. With them these cases are very few, and this is because a healthy corporate pride and mutual, corporate control is built up among their youngsters."¹

But can one even compare the youth organisations then in existence, which had nothing but vague phrases about socialism to offer, with the organisation of our young people? For we live as it were illumined by Bengal light, under which everything, even that which perhaps is grey, appears to us as a great festival of socialism. In this respect we are particularly fortunate.

Our young people in the Komsomol are not suppressed and kept down, driven into an underground existence, they are part of the state's work of construction, they

hold the childish hand of the young Pioneer and lead him too behind them, bringing him forward into the country's economy as the son and heir, for the master of that economy is the worker, the master is the peasant, and the Komsomol member and the Pioneer are their heirs and will continue their work.

That is why such vast opportunities for Communist education lie open to us. That is why, instead of discussing whether one ought not to introduce disciplinary measures, and what measures would be good ones to combat hooliganism among adolescents, etc., instead we must keep before our eyes just this: correct organisation of the Komsomol and Pioneer movements is the direct, broad and true road of Communist education, but here I repeat—*correct organisation*.

We can here note some harmful deviations, for instance the overloading of youngsters with work in the organisation, something which everyone is loudly complaining of just now. Youngsters rush headlong into social work and turn away from their studies. We are going to make a special study of all these questions and set them to rights, with first and foremost the sensitive and careful assistance of the teacher, for the teacher is the specialist in questions of the development of the small soul and the small body, the child's consciousness and the child's personality.

Without science, without the school as the main axis of development, we shall of course get nowhere. But there has never been anyone so carried away as to suppose that the Pioneer movement could take the place of the school and of higher education. Of course no one has gone as far as anything so wild. One must be linked with the other in harmony, in the most inward, profound and friendly manner. That, in brief and in general, is the cultural task of the Soviet government.

We need culture, starting with the ABC and ending with science, culture in the field of thought and culture in the field of feeling. Here I must tell you that the place occupied by science in the field of thought is in the field of feeling occupied by art. And in the degree of its achievements the old art (many parts of which are anything but harmful for us), the works of the world's great masters have a lot to offer. On this basis we are developing the new art,

which grows up from the soil of the old. It guides, develops, forges, leads onwards, organises our feeling, just as science organises and leads onward our thought. And if culture is thus necessary to us for our onward march to Communism, one can also say another thing: Communism makes no sense at all if it does not serve culture. Culture, education, science, art—these are not only a means whereby we move forward to the goal we set ourselves. They are at the same time a most high end in themselves.

What, after all, is Communism? Perhaps Communism is only the organisation of a particular policy, leading to the victory of the proletariat? We all know very well that it is not. It would be senseless to seize power if we did not make these people happy. Power is taken precisely in order to give people happiness. Perhaps this is a purely economic question? Perhaps we set ourselves the aim of leading people to freedom in order that they should work without wearing themselves out, that they should have a roof over their heads, food, clothing—and that is all? Of course not. Does man live in order to vegetate only, to put his trousers on each day, eat his piece of meat at midday, and in the evening go to bed? No. All this is merely a means by which to achieve a happy life.

Man does not live for the sake of these means. He needs to dress, eat, rest and work in order to extend his knowledge, develop his feelings and sensations, in order to know happiness, to be happy himself and give that happiness to others. Our final aim is to create a fraternal unity of people, such that it should raise itself higher and higher and fully extend all the material goods, all the wealth and opportunities open to a human being . . .

Culture is thus not only a means but an end. And the worker on the third front can say of himself, to the workers on the first front: I am helping you, and without me you cannot move one step, but the happy time will come when this first front—the bristling bayonets and roaring guns—will be no more. And to the workers on the economic front the third front man can say: you cannot hold on without me, but one can look forward and glimpse a coming time when economic achievements will be a matter of course, just a kitchen, in which most of the work will be done by machines. When these questions are solved, then we step,

in Engels' words, from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom.² Then cultural questions will remain, as the main questions, and then the first front and to a considerable extent the second front will merge in the third front. This, the third front, is the last but not the least worthy of attention; it is the last front in the sense that it realises the last, final goal, for the sake of which all are struggling, living, and dying.

Comrades, I ask your pardon, but I cannot limit myself to that part of my report which outlines our common tasks. A report on those lines, within those limits, could have been given by anyone, not the Commissar for Education of the Russian Soviet Republic. I want therefore to devote some time to considering more concrete tasks, that is, what we are now doing and what we can now do on our third front towards the fulfilment of that general plan which I have just sketched out for you.

First of all, it is absolutely clear that without a material basis any advancement in our work is unthinkable. We ourselves do not make money either directly or indirectly, we do not print money, as in the recent past at least the People's Commissariat for Finance did, and can still do in case of need. We do not produce any goods which can be sold abroad, we need the state to assign us money from local resources. These resources have up to this day been made available to us only on a very grudging scale.

I say this not for the sake of grumbling. We have moaned a good deal, and cursed as we argued with our comrades over the division of the meagre resources on which the state had to exist. And I think it would be taking a narrow departmental view of things if we were to say that up to now the third front has been starved of resources. No, we were given as much as was possible in view of the paucity of our means, in view of the importance of military tasks and the need to close up at least the most gaping holes in our economy. And now it would be shameful if the increase in the resources allocated to the third front were to be held up even for a minute.

And what do we see? In my report to the last session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee (VTsIK) I already shouted very loudly and sounded the alarm, drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that on our front mat-

ters are really intolerable.³ And I did this quite deliberately, since I know that there are resources now available and that one must tell the Executive Committee the truth. Of course scribblers abroad, from among our emigrés, draw conclusions from this about how poverty-stricken we are. They quote me, they quote N. K. Krupskaya, every time there is any mention by us of shortage of money. But we are not going to build Potyomkin villages⁴ and give ourselves and the Executive Committee rose-coloured spectacles to look through, merely for fear of providing food for their chatter.

We know the deficiencies and the harsh need in which we live, brought down upon our heads mainly by the crimes of these people. This is a thing from which we will recover and are recovering. And the first condition for recovery is that we should look properly at each wound and learn how it is to be cured.

Since that time we have moved forward to a quite exceptional degree. Then we named 78 million roubles as the ideal sum. We were given less—60 million. Now we have, in essence, the full amount that we were then asking. It has been said here that just recently nine and a half million has been added on to our allocation. This is incorrect. The amount added is 18 million, because one must include three and a half million out of the five million allocated to the fund for backward nationalities, one must include all the subsidy for teachers, for raising their pay, and in this way we get 18 million. Overall, the whole budget for the entire Union—the central budget—was last year 85 million. This year it is 140 million.

If we continue to advance at this rate, very soon we shall be home and dry. Of course the Commissariat for Finance (Narkomfin)⁵ tells us: we guarantee you an increase of 10 per cent for next year. But we leave this unheeded, as the Commissariat for Finance is there to cut things down, what else. If Narkomfin says 10 million, we say to ourselves: probably 30 or 40 million, we shan't settle for less.

Comrades, the situation is even more cheering as regards local funds, if, of course, one is to trust the calculations presented by Narkomfin, which they assure us are not exaggerated. Last year more than 80 million was promised, but in actual fact over the USSR as a whole 62 million was

allocated in real terms. This year we are promised 240 million, but let us be great pessimists, and suppose that a smaller percentage than last year will actually transpire, say—as people with “a good eye for figures”—180 million. Even that means three times as much as before. Thus, if we add it all up, it appears that last year we got by on 147 million, and this year we are going to have 320 million to live on.

At the same time it has been declared that the slogan now is—firmly, definitely and for a long time to come—“All Attention to the Countryside”. A large part of these resources will go in precisely that direction, to the countryside, to work in the villages. Then maybe we shall make a concerted effort to set about the main task.

For we must make a reality of universal compulsory education. And how many of our children are in fact attending school? In some places the percentage is below 20, and the average is 50 per cent (or it may be a bit less than fifty). We must double the number of schools. We need to have 250 thousand more teachers, or even more. You will see why. Can we do this now, or not? In part, comrades, only in part, for the network of schools which we now have is full of holes in many respects, or is made up of material that is rotten and can easily break apart. This network must be strengthened, and then we can talk about extending it.

Of course in places where the peasantry itself wants to build schools, they must be set up. We have a constant stream of petitioners at the Commissariat for Education, coming to us and saying, “We want to build a school, we contribute the timber, we provide the labour, we will pay the maintenance of a teacher, but we are short of so-and-so and such-and-such.” Not long ago, for instance, we had the following case. A petitioner arrives from Kursk province—a loan of 400 roubles is needed. “And as far as that goes,” he says, “we’ve already sown a special field which should give a harvest worth that much. When the corn is ripe, we will pay your loan back.” They had asked for the loan from the District Education Office, from the Provincial Education Office—no, they were told, we haven’t got 400 roubles. This comrade even showed me a paper whereby the higher, provincial office authorised the issue of 10 planks for the

building of a school. And the answer of the office lower down the line: no planks in stock.

So these comrades come to us. Of course we have not got resources of this nature, we are not a bank, we cannot issue loans, but none the less I arranged that these 400 roubles should be found, because it hurts to see the good intent of peasant people frustrated for lack of the odd copper.

Locally, then, one has to manoeuvre as best one can. We must meet the peasantry half-way, otherwise there is disgruntled talk among them, and rightly so. We too dream of the time when our youngsters will not have to trot six or seven versts to school, but will have a school in their own village. Insofar as there is this desire to build, insofar as there are provinces prosperous enough to do so, we do not object to building programmes.

But let us consider a little how matters stand in reality with our school network. When we did calculations to discover how much money would be needed to repair our schools so that they should not be standing without roofs, without stoves, like a ruin in a fairy tale (for this question is really one that cries to high heaven)—when we worked out how much would be needed, it emerged that it would be a round sum in the neighbourhood of 25 million roubles. That would be just to put the already existing schools into something like a presentable state. We brought this to the attention of the All-Russia Executive Committee, and it passed a resolution that as from next year a special building fund⁶ should be organised under the Commissariat for Education and the Provincial Education Offices, this fund being for the primary purpose of repair work, but also, I think, able to advance money to the peasantry when they wish to build schools themselves.

When school buildings have been put in order, there arises the question of textbooks and school equipment. There aren't any? Perhaps there really aren't any? Read the report of Gosizdat (the State Publishing House)⁷: there are up to 23 million copies of textbooks available, that is about the number required, roughly. We could provide these textbooks for almost all the pupils hungering for them, but the books are lying in the stores, either at the Commissariat or in the provinces. They are not moving, or only moving very sluggishly.

These are new textbooks, checked by the State Teachers' Council, but out in the localities the old textbooks reign, and from what our teachers tell us they reign right royally. The teacher cannot get away from them. It is they that dictate to the teacher, in cracked and ancient tones, what he is to do in school. These are ancient, tattered old books, for which the peasants pay high prices, pay by the pood. (This is true, they say that in some parts of Russia the price of a schoolbook is so many poods' weight of grain). This is an enormous mix-up, which everyone must help to sort out. Teachers' representatives have come to me and said, "Gosizdat has bad material, the cooperatives pay little attention to such matters, put the whole business into the hands of the teachers."

In this connection I think that Tsekpros⁸ in particular should develop its book-publishing side, as it is successfully developing its book-trading side now. Perhaps we must bring into this business the Provincial and District Education Offices, the education workers out in the sub-districts, because there are textbooks, and textbooks which are not excessively expensive either, and yet none the less they are not moving. And they should be moving. Where the price is high everything must be done to bring it down, because we must not fail to put books into the hands of the children whose education we are speaking of as being a most urgent need.

The problem is not to think out, write or print textbooks. They have been thought out, written, and printed, they are lying on the shelf—but they are not in the schools. This abnormal state of affairs must be done away with. New textbooks bring with them new methods. N. K. Krupskaya⁹ will be speaking especially about this, so I will not dwell on this. It is clear that this must be one of our central tasks.

We cannot be satisfied with the sort of schooling that used to be considered sufficient. We have to find the road to a school with life in it. At a consultation meeting with teachers I was told that the peasants are not satisfied with the new school. The peasant says, "The old school taught you your letters, but now a lad comes home and you ask him, 'What have you learned—to write, do sums, read?' and he hasn't learned much reading and writing. When you

ask him what he has learned he replies, 'We go on excursions, we make models, we draw.' And the peasant is not happy about it.

I think this is already in the past. I remember how in 1919, in Kostroma province, in one of the villages a peasant complained to me that the teacher made idols and sang songs and did nothing else. Of course what is new in our school is not that we do not teach children to read and write, not that we don't have the ABC but we do have "work in complex".¹⁰ The first task of the school, and the first task of the new method, is to bring the school closer to the understanding of the peasant.

We are unable at present to bring the school closer to the peasant's understanding, because the peasant wants us to teach his little lad to bow to prejudices, i.e. to educate him in the fear of God and of man. I remember one peasant, true he was a peasant of kulak type (since he had a small starch works of his own at the time), complaining that not only had they taken the icons out of the school and stopped teaching Scripture, but when he gave his Vanyushka one over the ear-hole, the latter told him that the Soviet government said people weren't to be beaten. And that was the influence of school. In that kind of connection, of course, we cannot bring the school closer to the peasant. We cannot beat children, but we must bring the school closer to the peasant in such a way that he will understand the aims of our education. We must bring the school to him so that he, the muzhik, will understand and see that the school gives good training for a knowledgeable husbandman. But if a young lad reads and writes badly, no complex methods will save the school.

The school must pursue the aim of, on the one hand, effective literacy, which will be immediately evident, which will be taught rapidly, simply and well in the school, and after that the school must give essential knowledge of agriculture and by so doing be itself a help to agriculture. For example, even in bourgeois Switzerland, as my neighbour there who was a gardener told me, his young son used to come home from school and give him valuable advice on cultivation. Here, where the level of peasant farming is low, one can provide a vast amount of advice. And agricultural science can extend its care for our farming economy through

the school, can help it through the children, teaching how to treat a sick cow or providing information on how vegetable crops should be sown. Every school can set an example, so that the eggs will be teaching the hen.

When the peasant sees that through the school he receives useful knowledge on farming, then he will respect the school.

One must turn the school not only into an instrument for raising the level of consciousness in agricultural science among the rising generation of peasants, but also into an instrument for raising the general level of consciousness of all, adult peasants too. America, with its vast network of farmers, is doing this already. At the last agricultural conference we brought this matter up most seriously.

What is needed is that the agricultural colleges, the places of higher education, should each take a certain geographical area under their care, that they should bring together teachers and pupils from the secondary schools, out of these produce instructors, and the latter will then travel round the schools and give instruction. Every secondary-level place of agricultural education should have its own area to look after. The basic unit must be the village teacher. He needs to know about bee-keeping, say, and horticulture, this or that branch of farming, so that from day to day and from month to month he can develop this or that aspect of the peasant economy, through creating special children's clubs and organisations.

America teaches its farmers through their children, though those farmers have developed economies far beyond the reach of our peasant. We must teach our peasants, whose husbandry is on a very low level, and in the very near future we must make this a reality in at least a few areas. This is school re-organisation for you.

Let no one think I am against the State Teachers' Council curriculum or the complex method. On the contrary, I am wholly in favour of both. They are a step towards the realisation of a true labour school, towards the creation of a genuine Communist school, and quite a big step too. But one must think out methods in such a way, and give the teacher instructions of such a kind that he should not overreach himself. And this does happen. The teacher is puzzling his head over the Council's curriculum, and in the

meantime the children are growing up illiterate. This cannot be allowed. We must link together in harmony our methodological directives and the possibilities of real work.

We are often asked in what way it is possible to acquire technical skills: "We are groping our way through the forest of complex methods, and lagging behind in gaining technical skills and knowledge." This should not be. A general barometer here must be the following: if the peasant respects the school, it is a good one. But this has to be attained not by making concessions and going along with religion, or by relaxing standards on discipline, but by acting so that the peasant says, "They teach the children what's what in school, they teach them what they need to know." That is what shows that the complex method and the Council's curriculum are correct, for they are calculated to bring life into the school and make it as close to life as possible.

Now something must be said about the material situation of the teaching body, for it goes without saying that, however dedicated it may be (and it is very dedicated), none of the less material conditions do exist. As has been said here, they are the floor on which we stand. If you fall through that, everything is upside-down; a person cannot work when he or she has not got material security.

What are the tasks that face us in this connection? Now, during this year, by means of an assignation of 7 million and a supplementary assignation of 5 (with the promise of something to be added to these from local resources), we have raised the average obligatory salary of a teacher up to 28 roubles (per month). Very often it is said, "In many provinces this has been exceeded already. Why are you making us a present of your 28 roubles when we have much more than that?" This is wrong, for the money is going to the very poorest provinces. If 12 million is being given, someone is going to be the better for it. It is after all impossible that, once an additional sum has been received, salaries should not go up, that these extra 12 millions should not improve anything. This does not happen. But are these 12 million on the way, and will they really go to you? Will the local authorities not use them for other purposes, will this money not be diverted in some disguised form to other purposes, even in some form offensive to the teaching body? We say, "We hereby give 12 million over to the loca-

lities. You—they—must add three and a half million of your own funds to this, and so increase salaries to an average of 28 roubles." And what did we get in response to this? A reduction in the number of schools.

Just recently we got from Tsaritsyn province (if there are teachers from Tsaritsyn here, they know about this) an ultimatum as follows: "Rustle up an additional assignation and subsidy for us, or else we reduce the number of schools," although such action has been forbidden many times over. And Tsaritsyn province is not alone in this respect. In fact, in those places where directives from central government are received concerning increases in the amount paid to teachers, they are cutting down the number of schools in our already scanty network.

Or another trick: they hire teachers for 7 months; the remaining 5 months are non-working time, holidays, live as best you can. This produces an interesting situation: you used to get 15 roubles, now you can have 28, but multiplied by seven instead of by twelve. This is clearly offensive, and clearly fraudulent. It is deceiving not only the teacher but the central government, which did not want this.

Or you have the overloading, the colossal overloading of one teacher, who is compelled to work with a hundred or so children, and this can in no way be done. You get an ever-increasing volume of work when the teacher cannot cope, and all the salary increase goes down the drain and yields precisely no return. Two teachers are needed here. It is clear as the day, but this conclusion is not drawn—flounder on as best you can, and for next year you'll be getting another 25 pupils. In this way it can be made to look as though the needs of the peasantry are being met without having to extend the school network. It is clear that if we cannot build new schools, we must at least increase the number of teachers, and without this the reform will yield no results.

This is why there were recently set up by law control commissions with the participation of Provincial Education Offices, the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection¹¹ authorities and so on, empowered to check on the actual implementation of the law. This will be their responsibility, and we in the Commissariat for Education ask you to let us know, through Tsekpros and directly, of any instances which flout

the intention of the legislator, which is that the teacher should receive 28 real roubles, multiplied by twelve, for normal teaching duties. If the commissions do not keep an eye on this, we shall bring them up to scratch. The law is not promulgated in order that people shall find ways round it, but in order that the cultural front shall be brought up to a higher level.

Alongside these material conditions, which are going to be improved, there is also the law on pensions.¹²

Then, it is vital that very serious attention should be paid to the status of the teacher. A lot has been said about this here, and I have a whole mass of material. I hope, I am even sure, that in this mass of material there is a great deal of teachers' nerves (they were cross and are exaggerating), and that if one listens to the other side, much will fall to the ground and seem less bad. If it was all true, then certainly it would be impossible not to be shocked to the depths of one's soul. But if only part of it is true, still this is something that must be firmly dealt with once and for all.

What is to be done in this matter? I think that this congress is a powerful remedy in itself. Here we have representatives of the government and of the Party who have just been talking loudly about the need to raise the dignity of the teacher, to recognise him as having equal rights with the proletarian worker in industry. It has been said here that the teacher is a most valuable worker in society, that through him the alliance with the peasantry is operated in real terms. It has been said here that we are going to put up severe opposition to any representatives of government, Party or Young Communist League who fail to recognise this and to live up to it. A great deal has been said here about putting a stop to disgraceful manifestations arising from lack of understanding of the teacher's importance.

But action must be continued. Here the role of Tsekpros is immense, and in some cases Tsekpros has been silent: it seemed not to be aware of its own strength, and that strength is great. It is not true that our country is without justice, that a chance-come Jack-in-office can grind a teacher's face in the dust. It is not true that the dignity of a person engaged in raising a new generation of human beings can be attacked, and no means be found to deal with the Jack-in-office responsible for the attack. Such cases must be brought to the attention of the Commissariat for Education,

and we shall organise and have in readiness a special section in our control apparatus, which will respond quickly to such infringements of the law. And in any case where the arm of the Commissariat is not long enough, the arm of the Central Executive Committee and the Party, to whom we shall turn, will certainly reach sufficiently far.

But, comrades, we are still facing a situation (even though we are on the eve of a significant improvement in all aspects of education) in which primary education draws in only 50 per cent of children. And the others?

We talk about doing away with illiteracy, but half of our population is again growing up illiterate. Clearly, help must be given here. It will be still some time before we reach the longed-for day when we shall have education obligatory for all and accessible to all. But to allow the number of illiterate youngsters to continue growing is also something we cannot have.

That is why I have a deep feeling in favour of the idea first put forward by N. K. Krupskaya. Without fearing that someone may see in it a lowering of our educational ideals, we consider it vital that we should at once set about creating an auxiliary system of schools, may be one-year schools only, for older children who are not finding their way into the normal schools. This year we have received an allocation for the first time, of half a million, for the first experiments in setting up such schools. Of course with half a million we cannot move very far forward. We believe that this should produce immediately an inflow of funds from local resources, which are increasing all the time. Besides, this year it will be only a first experiment. It is an experiment of importance.

But when we were getting this legislation put through,¹³ we met with bewildered questions, even from some members of government. Why, they asked, are you "doing away with illiteracy", why are you asking for more money, when you have only just received 1,030,000 extra? You are doing work that makes no sense. Why should you be teaching adults? Pay attention to your schools, bring all children into the schools, then there will be no need to wipe out illiteracy, it will be done away with in school.

This is clearly a misunderstanding. And often comrades speaking from positions within our field of work show the

same lack of understanding. It is absolutely clear that we cannot wait. We cannot let adults who are making history, on whom our tomorrow depends, remain illiterate. This is not a matter that can wait until today's children grow up. It is a job that must be done now.

In the business of wiping out illiteracy we have many achievements to show, since we provide teaching for the army, for the organised workers, for those living in towns, for the Young Communist League, for youngsters awaiting call-up, etc. But when we move on to eradicating illiteracy in the countryside, for those of quite high age-groups, according to the provisions we have laid down, then we meet with a solid resistance: the peasant has no time, the peasant has no interest.

We have become convinced that the old method of getting rid of illiteracy, whereby the "enlightener" stayed where he was and the peasants had to come to him, is no good. We are now going over to work with illiterates in small groups, or even in some cases individually. We ourselves now go to the peasant, ABC book in hand, if he will not come to us. And besides this, immense attention must be given to the barely literate. They must be given literature, given things to read, made to understand that reading is an essential economic activity, that he cannot live without it. And to do this we have to provide appropriate literature.

These are immense problems. Essentially, of course, the whole of the countryside is barely literate. It may know its letters well enough so far as concerns reading and writing in some particular instances, but politically and culturally it is barely literate. And we have to raise it up, not only in the person of its children, but of its adults as well. In this connection our work must be done in synthesis, i.e. tied together in one knot. And the central knot in the work we make the village reading-room.¹⁴ In the village the reading-room should be a place where the peasant can get information, it should be a place where laws, decrees and newspapers are read out publicly, it should be a place where the pulse of local life is followed, where a wall-newspaper is kept, where books can be borrowed and read, it should be a source of advice and a place of meetings. From time to time there should without fail be lectures on all the most

important cultural matters: on health, on matters of farming, etc.

In this connection the person in charge of the reading-room must know a lot, must be able to talk with peasants, and to draw together local forces—health workers, the Ministry of Agriculture's representatives, the local Peasant Committees, the workers of the local Soviet, all those working in the schools, the Party branch, the Young Communist League—all these must be drawn together at the reading-room.

The village reading-room must become a centre which draws to itself all that brings light to the village, and in its turn be itself a source shedding light on everything.

Comrades, there will be a separate report on the Young Communist League, but I too cannot pass this notable phenomenon by without remark. I have to say that in the field of popular education as a whole, and in that of village education in particular, the Commissariat for Education owes much to the League. The Young Communist League not only shows a vast amount of youthful ardour, a liveliness greater than we can muster, but it also shows a great practicality, an ability to grasp and note a task at once, and do so soberly and realistically, and then push it through. From this point of view we are not only grateful to the League, we have formed links with it throughout all our work, and would wish this to be done by all our bodies right down to the lowest educational establishments as it has been done in the Commissariat itself.

Of course one cannot deny that there are deviations and shortcomings in the work of the League—matters in which their youth tells against them, and which have been pointed to even by the Secretary of the League's Central Committee. But we are still convinced that after this congress the work of the League will settle into an even better planned and more normal course. In the matter of "paying attention to the countryside" the Young Communist League has undoubtedly played a considerable part. It is helping us to set up a network of agricultural groups and schools for peasant youth, the purpose of these being to take the place of the somewhat cumbrous "second-stage schools" or seven-year schools existing in country areas—helping us to replace them with schools exceedingly well suited to

country conditions, schools which turn out a rural intellectual or intellectual peasant, who can work in the local organs of Soviet government, in the cooperative movement etc.—a truly educated husbandman. This is an immense task.

The four-year school, let alone the incomplete four-year school, can never produce anything of the kind. We need to work towards an abundant provision of peasant schools.

Some people have expressed objections, asking us, "Why *peasant* schools, specifically? Do you want to confine the peasantry to the bounds of their own class—why should a peasant not study in the universal school?" Because we have no universal school, and indeed cannot have it. The real, complete, Marxist school, such as Marx foresaw it, can only be realised in practice in an educational establishment which stands alongside the industrial establishment and shares in the latter's life. That is why our Mill and Works Apprentice Schools ("fabzavuchi") are important, not only because they are producing a new generation of workers to take over from those of today, but also because this new generation must be highly trained technically and conscious of their role in Communist terms; it is they that provide a model of how to raise up all our schools to be truly Marxist schools. Only the Apprentice Schools are placed in the fortunate circumstances under which a Marxist school can be made a reality. That is why we have brought into being, for the proletariat, the seven-year school with industrial work as an integral part of its programme, and the Apprentice Schools.

Only a small percentage of the population, even at best, will go through institutions of higher education. The majority will be left with completion of this nine-year schooling as their only qualification. Where will they go?

It would appear, from observation of real life, that there is nowhere for them to go, they are not equipped for life. In this connection we are carrying through an emergency reform, and a profound one, which transforms the two final classes of the second-stage school into a vocational-type school. Several options are being provided. We are directing the schools towards training propaganda workers, personnel for the cooperative movement, teachers for the "eradicating illiteracy" campaign, and staff for reading-rooms and club-

houses. We need people for all these jobs, and to train them does not require lecturers with higher education.

Why should a peasant follow this direction? This kind of school we are creating for the young people of the towns who have nowhere to go.

The country school is a school that provides people for work in the countryside. Through it the country areas will acquire cultural workers who will stay in the country. Those who complete the country school can also go on to higher education or to Apprentice Schools just as do those completing second-stage school; it will be the most able children who do this, the ones who show a bent or talent for this or that subject. As these schools cost a lot of money and it is not possible to provide them on a wide scale within a short time, it is here that agricultural study groups come in, where young people can meet, and discussions on questions of social interest can be held under the guidance of the Young Communist League and with the participation of whatever cultural forces the League can make available for this work. To the best of my knowledge, these agricultural groups are well developed and offer a good form of organisation reaching beyond the peasant youth belonging to the League.

One word more—on pre-school education. This began under the influence of revolutionary enthusiasm, but regrettably, later it boiled down to practically nothing. I am not going to speak of the general significance of pre-school education. It is clear to one and all that it is easier to mould a child's soul before the age of seven, and that a proper approach to education must start there. It is clear that pre-school provision, starting with the day nursery and going on to nursery school, makes things easier for the mother. Working towards this is the main road to enabling women to develop themselves, and to enabling them, also, to take part in the life of society.¹⁵

Here the countryside is a case for special consideration, since here we can have the closest of links with the peasant woman—the most disadvantaged half, but still about a half of all our rural population. We can make contact with the peasant woman through proper care for her children, through proper organisation of the health aspect of child care. We can make a start here in the most elementary

way—with the playgrounds, helping the peasant woman and making her position easier.

We know from the reports of the students who last year were sent out to a whole series of places throughout the country, what good results their work yielded not only for the children they were looking after, but how useful their work was in the way of establishing a definite link-up with the peasantry.

In the very near future we shall try and find the resources and the people needed to make a start on developing pre-school work. And to make that start in the countryside, where it is most poorly represented now, but where it is no less necessary than in industrial districts, and much more necessary than in inner urban districts, which is where it has been preserved to some extent.

I want to say a few more words yet, concerning the social role of the teaching profession, inasmuch as this is tied up with the tasks of enlightenment to which I have particularly drawn your attention.

This is what I would like to say to you: the teacher is a person who looks after the correct growth and development of a new organism, indeed of a whole entity made up of such organisms. The teacher, collectively—the body of teachers—is looking after the proper growth of a new generation. And we say this: not only may that new generation grow wrongly and all awry, through illiteracy, darkness and ignorance, grow up deformed physically and deformed in its consciousness, but here in this country the adult people of the countryside, though wise in peasant wisdom and bitter experience, remain children in many respects.

In social terms the peasants represent a kind of children—they have to grow and develop, and so far as social consciousness is concerned they have to grow under the influence of their more developed, more organised brother—the worker. But the worker is not in touch with the peasant everywhere. The influence, the effect of the worker on the peasant is often a pretty arguable, pretty remote thing.

There is nothing to suggest that the peasants, left to their own devices, will grow and develop correctly. They too need teachers. Otherwise they may become distorted and go the wrong way. Why so?

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin on many occasions has told us and taught us: the peasant is a dualistic being. As a labourer in the fields, rewarded very meagrely for his labour, he is the brother of the worker, he is the object of exploitation, he is a labouring man. But as the seller of the product of his labour on the market, he is a trader. One side of his nature draws him in the direction of the proletariat, the other pulls him towards the bourgeoisie. The more a peasant works and the less he trades, the nearer he is to the poor-peasant end of the spectrum, the more natural it is to him to be our ally. The more a peasant is transformed into a village trader, the more there is in him of the *kulak*,¹⁶ the more of an interest he has in aims which may not coincide with the aims that the proletariat sets itself. At the same time the *kulaks* are the more developed, more influential section of the peasantry, they lure it into their nets, and by various ingenious arguments and promises they draw the peasantry as a whole nearer to—of course—the petty-bourgeois line of development, the false road that can be disguised for the occasion by various fine phrases...

This means that the peasant has to choose between two forces, between the revolutionary proletariat and the bourgeoisie. To choose the bourgeoisie means, for the peasant, to put himself and his children into bondage for decades more. Communism, on the contrary, brought to the countryside by the worker through the schools, through the newspapers, through the village reading-rooms, through the co-operatives, through factories acting as "patrons"—this Communism is in essence a profoundly peasant movement, for at no point along its road does it do violence to the peasants, in no way does it run counter to the interests of the middle and the poor peasant.

It is Communism that is leading to that higher form of economy under which there will be no poor people, not only in towns but in the country too, and under which the individual peasant economy will peacefully and naturally, according to plan, broaden out into the social economy, enabling the peasant to live a life incomparably more worthy of a human being than the life he now leads.

And this is why until recently the teacher stood at the cross-roads, and these two forces fought to have him. Petty-bourgeois ideology made it one of its trump cards that "the

people's teachers are with us", and that those teachers were in their hearts, essentially, SRs.¹⁷ The petty-bourgeois ideologists said that the peasantry was the elemental force which would devour us and wipe the Soviet cities off the face of the earth. That danger is of course now past. It is clear that on this point the proletariat has been victorious, that the proletariat has captivated—in the best sense—the teacher, that the teacher has realised the falsehood of the phoney rural ideologists and has grasped that he as a carrier of enlightenment needs to bring not enlightenment in general, but enlightenment organised in the manner that alone can make it true enlightenment—the enlightenment of Communism.

It is precisely in this sense that the teacher forms a factor of immense importance in the link-up with the peasantry.

But he is not only a factor in the link-up with the peasantry. There is yet another gigantic force with which we cannot make contact without the teacher, with which only the teacher links us, the Communist Party, and without which he, the teacher, is a cipher.

What force is this? It is the coming generation. Dead indeed would be our cause, if our children did not follow in our footsteps. And they must follow in our steps as people with better education than we ourselves had. And their education comes from the teacher and educator who stands by the side of the young worker, the young peasant, who must carry on the work we have begun.

The biological river of life flows on, some pass away, others enter upon a new life, and the new entrants are infected by the dirt in the water of the river. Children are infected with all the ills, so to speak, of past generations, and the schools in the West are infected. But we are organising inoculations against infection.

On the other hand, this ancient, millennial river of culture has produced enormous results. These results need to be injected, gently and rationally, into the rising generation. What did the bourgeoisie use to do? It hid the truth. It did not make available the best sides of culture to children, or certainly not to the children of the classes it exploited.

The teacher—all our educational apparatus—stands there

like a grandiose filter through which the new life has to pass. He must cleanse the bourgeois and feudal grime from what is called public education, and enrich it with all the good there has been, all the happy discoveries made during centuries upon centuries, enrich it with the latest discoveries of science, and especially with the latest discoveries of our Communist science of society. In that way he will indeed be able to cause a giant turn of events, an immense revolution. That revolution is, that people will become better. From out this workshop will come human beings of a new, pure and noble model.

We are still "maimed and hump-backed", and dirty, and vicious, and ignorant. The old system made us so. But we have made colossal efforts to ensure—being conscious of our own deformity—that future humanity shall have a healthy life.

Who is to do this work, or most of it? The teacher. Here of course one may ask oneself: is the teacher himself ready for this great mission? And how can one teach another without having himself been taught? And does the teacher approach even remotely such a state of perfection, and will he be able to accomplish so lofty a task?

Of course, comrades, the teacher must learn himself, but he must learn while he teaches. Insofar as he devotes himself wholly, in deed and in thought, to the colossal task of re-educating that part of humanity which now lives inspired by our red banner, he will in the course of the work itself become brighter and purer with each passing day, and morally more of a Communist, and will approach more nearly to the type of human being that he, perhaps, will never realise in himself, but which he will realise in his pupils.

Such is the vocation of a teacher in our time, comrades. And that is why many, many people may envy you the richness and interest of the work that lies before you.

We all know that things are hard for you, but for whom are they not hard these days? Yet at the same time they are joyful, for man lives not only by those things that cause him weariness and suffering. We know how all of life is transformed by the sense of duty done, and a duty that is something vast and of import to the history of the whole world. In this sense, comrades, you can congratulate

yourselves that you are teachers, and teachers of these very times, these bitter but glorious years of change.

You are the outriders of the new world, those engaged in immediate struggle for the new man, laying hold upon him in his tender years and making him better. Of course this is a work that takes time. Those of you who are now young will perhaps be grayhaired before it is done. Not all at once, not at the wave of a magic wand, not by the new methodology shall we carry this work through, but carry it through we must!

So, the teacher is, as our leaders have said, a firm link for us with the peasantry, and thus ensures our present. The teacher is a firm link with the generation to come, and so ensures that the future shall be ours.

Comrades, besides the two thousand teachers sitting here there are hundreds of thousands of workers for enlightenment throughout the whole of our Union, listening to what is being done here. Among this whole mass of teachers there are of course not a few who are still bent in the back, who feel themselves injured, who are undecided, who are frightened. May the voice not only of all our Party and of our government, but of your Congress too, ring out through all the land, saying: "Teacher, stand tall! Stand tall, teacher, and in the awareness of your own dignity take up the uncommonly difficult, but uncommonly glorious place that belongs to you in the building of a new culture!"

THE ART OF THE WORD IN SCHOOL

An American educationist, with whom I had occasion to speak as long ago as 1919, told me: "Not everyone has yet realised that the pencil is an essential tool for one and all, a means of communication. Why," he said, "when you're explaining to someone else what you've seen, you straight-away jot down a sketch or a plan in your notebook to show the other person. However clear your speech or written notes may be, the only thing that is really clear, *visually* clear, is a drawing or a plan. A person who isn't capable of using a pencil to draw with is a half-dumb, half-literate person."

All this was well said. This American educationist also gave an excellent exposition of the idea that a lesson given by a teacher of any subject should consist largely, up to 50 per cent of it, of explanation in chalk on the blackboard. All this is true. But language is even more important than the pencil.

Has everything been done to produce mastery of that tool, meaning language both spoken and written? It evidently has not. If the state of things with regard to really efficient command of that "instrument" was a sad one in the pre-war school, so far we ourselves have not only failed to make any advance, we have gone backwards somewhat.

The tasks in teaching language have many facets, but one may divide them into three main aspects: 1) elementary command of language, i.e. the acquisition of a certain vocabulary, the ability to construct a sentence correctly when speaking and when writing, to spell correctly, etc.; 2) the ability to use language to describe accurately external things or events or to express a logical train of thought. This is the side of language which has to be developed to perfection in any man of science or learning—the ability to formulate economically and at the same time with per-

fect clarity the content of the thought that is to be conveyed to his hearers or readers. Since everyone needs to be to some extent "learned", that is able to analyse facts, draw conclusions and convey the results of his mental work to others, the aim of the school must be to produce the nearest possible approach to complete mastery of language as a precise instrument for describing phenomena and ideas.

The third aspect concerns literature—the artistic use of language.

A great disaster—a cultural reduction to beggary—would await a man who made his life completely, consistently "individual". We do not, of course, take Henri Bergson's¹ point of view, that in fact intellectual thought and prose language are something in the nature of a conventional lie, a convention which people accept, and that only intuition, artistic perception and artistic language, filled with music, can to some extent reflect the true external and internal world. This is not the point, to counterpose intellect on the one hand and emotional life on the other. They should not be counterposed, but united, and that in such a way that they do not hinder one another, in real human life. The clearest of intellects can and should be joined with a warm and responsive heart. But in the field of acquiring *linguistic* techniques the tasks must willy-nilly be separately delimited.

Didactic interpolations appear strange and wearisome in a poem, and so does precise exposition of facts in a novel. True, in cases where statistics or the statement of facts on certain mass phenomena are in themselves moving, we find shifts to scientific, publicistic prose, within literary works, which do not jar upon us. Many pages in Gleb Uspensky's works,² for instance, are in themselves almost too dry for artistry, but being as they are set in relief by an artistic approach to the subject and shot through here and there by the lightning, as it were, of a brilliant image or emotional expression, and are perceived even today—let alone in their own time, when all that was a live issue—as truly artistic work. The same may be said of the interpolations on sociology, statistics and public health in the novels of Pierre Hamp,³ which deal with various forms of labour and industry, and of the passages in "straight" and precisely ana-

lytical prose which abound in the lively, ardent and artistic works of Dmitri Furmanov.⁴

But all these are the exceptions. It is another exception that a scientist, not only in a work of popularisation but in strictly scientific writing as well, may from time to time give way to the need of live emotional contact with his readers, and use the language of the literary artist.

By and large though, these are two separate and essentially different uses of human language. In the one case the aim is to eliminate the personal, to state the facts, which are laid out before you as they would be by anyone who had the necessary vision, observation, knowledge and ability to express himself. This is objective language. And every effort must be made to train children and young people in the skill of objective description, for this also teaches objectivity in thought. Objectivity is a great power in a human being. The loss of objectivity, of calm, of impartiality in observation and of total accuracy in expression means leaving the human being without defence against the environment.

In the second case, on the contrary, we have the aim of speaking of the external world after it has passed through the inner world, that is of giving it vividness, temperament, the feel of the passing moment, all the things that make it truly individual. An artistic work is always original; it is a subjective reflection of reality or of the inner phenomena of human consciousness. Of course when this originality slips into deliberate effort to be original, or when we find ourselves faced with someone so original that his feelings are peculiar to him alone, then the link between narrator or writer and his audience is broken.

This is the basis of the group or class nature of literature. The subject chosen by a given narrator or writer may have much in it that is familiar to particular groups—the landowning class, the bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, etc.—but have nothing in common with workers or peasants. A writer becomes a group spokesman because he in his subjectivity gives responses to external facts—lively, expressive responses,—which are on the whole those proper to a particular category of human beings. Lev Tolstoy considered that the truly great writer is the one who approaches most nearly to “common humanity”, i.e. that the im-

mense originality of the genius lies in his ability to give us, with a power beyond the reach of others, artistic formulae won by the sweat and blood of human feeling, for our relationships with the great phenomena of nature, of social life, of private life, and so on,—formulae which are valid, though hidden, for all people, while it is only after that formulation of genius has been given that they become conscious of their hitherto vague feelings.⁵ But in a society sharply divided into classes such geniuses for all humanity are an improbable occurrence, and then only when they emerge from a comparatively undefined group, for instance the petty bourgeoisie, and when they deal with the most universal of matters.

For our time, it is becoming obvious that the task is to acquire the skill of expressing in art the external world and inner experience in language which must be crystal clear, in language which can be most easily approached by the whole vast variety of the worker and peasant masses now irrupting into social and cultural life. Themes and images must be taken from all the processes, of close concern to the masses, of the building of the new life, and this includes both the creation of great things and the moulding of the new man. The whole grandiose revolutionary process taking place around us is far from revolving only within the restricted framework of questions intellectually posed and intellectually solved. Knowledge and technological skill do not suffice here; a very great effort of will is called for, a profound understanding of one's fellow-men, the ability to bring heterogeneous beings into harmony, the ability to work with others, and the ability to revise—in view of the moulding of the new man—at our relationships to all the basic, almost unchanging phenomena such as love, death, etc.

Can the school make an approach, to some degree, to this task? Of course it can. But is it easy to define the way the school should take in this? This of course is very difficult.

The great writers who came from the nobility and from the third-estate intelligentsia made an uncommonly large contribution to perfecting our language. Without studying the models offered by these classics (from the point of view of language as a tool, as the material with which one

will have to operate) one cannot envisage even the most elementary progress being made in the schools towards gaining command of language as an instrument of creativity and as a means of influencing people through art. But at the same time the classics are limited, of course, by their time, and by the groups whose ideology they expressed. In the days of Pushkin⁶ and Gogol⁷ we had a quite different tempo of life. And since those days our vocabulary too has been extended, and the rhythm of our tasks and our actions has changed. It is impossible for our language not to have undergone very material changes in consequence. Yet where among our new writers is there anything in this respect which has really "jelled", is really of value; where are the results of successful searchings? The over-mannered kind of style which is apt to appear in any age, and the individualistic mopping and mowing which under the guise of "new trends" is characteristic of the decline of European bourgeois culture—these have infected us too with their latest "-isms".

A classic may appear a little out of date not only in subject-matter, in what he offers, but also in *how* he offers it. None the less, we have here something tried and tested, something that has stood its ground, a high-quality article. For this reason we cannot do other than start with the classics, as the foundation, as the basic series of models for study and imitation. But we would make a huge mistake if we cut ourselves off from contemporary literature. Even apart from the fact that its themes and its mental and emotional lines of development are for us live and close, it must in its forms also, undoubtedly, reflect with this or that degree of accuracy the actual changes of taste and mode of expression proper to a life that has moved on a long way.

Children need first of all to be taught to appreciate not only the content but the form of literary works (as soon as they reach an age at which such an approach becomes possible); their attention must be drawn to the musicality, vividness, expressiveness of this or that phrase, to the plasticity or dynamism of this or that figure of speech, and explanation made of how this is achieved,—this comes within the purview of study of the classics as part of school lessons. At the same time, as children are made

increasingly acquainted with the classics, more and more attention should be given to separating out what in them is of their own times (and in doing so, indicating what special conditions of those times were responsible, to the extent to which the given age-group can appreciate these), and what is of long-term value, still profound and significant for our own day, again indicating why this or that artist and thinker was able to feel his way to a formulation which has remained valid perhaps for thousands of years.

Great care is called for in reading modern authors. Great tact is needed in order to differentiate between that in their works which is a good echo of the classics, that which is really a brilliant modern advance in point of form, and that which is unsuccessful conjuring, ornamental verbal sleigh-bells that in fact distort rather than adorn the basic tenor of the work.

The same needs to be said so far as content is concerned. The new literature is very patchy. Here one finds both the over-strained effort to express something that the author does not really feel (sometimes descending to sheer, hack-work falsity), and the actual failure to encompass the immense new content attempted, and, of course, the first words of full-carat gold on the facts of post-revolutionary life and consciousness.

In school-children's own attempts to write one must start by drawing them on to direct, spontaneous and therefore always artistic narration of events which they themselves have lived through. This direct realism of what one may call "memoire" writing should in my view be the main pillar in school pupils' attempts to use language as an instrument of art. It is a very good thing if these attempts are made not only in writing, but orally as well. The artistic relation of what has been actually lived through can be very powerful. Those who have ability in this direction should be given encouragement; those who have little ability should be helped to acquire at least a certain competence.

But alongside this, let us admit fantasy too. Our "new" children today have been to a considerable degree detached from religious superstitions. Their imaginations are not clogged with all manner of ancient nonsense. They are not

likely to launch out into absurd or morbid imaginings. None the less, to dream dreams is proper to childhood and early adolescence (and to later adolescence—but in a somewhat different form). Dreams, starting with children's fibbing and make-believe and ending with fervent novels written by young people, outpourings of longing for the as yet unknown life at the threshold of which the young person stands—all these are as it were battle manoeuvres in the mind, a game, an exercise, leading up to the fulness of activity of the mature person. Of course if one goes too far on this line, it is possible to impel some individuals into becoming intoxicated with dreams as such, into such "solitary delights" of fantastic imaginings that the latter will later become nothing but a barrier between that individual and real life. But it should be remembered that these tendencies to build dream-worlds become hypertrophied—and often produce artistically quite amazing fruit—only in times that do not summon people to action, do not open up wide avenues for real creativity to the individual.

Our times are not such; our day is practical, militant, technological. We even hear voices from among our young people to the effect that we do not need passion, pathos, or enthusiasm, that we do not need far-reaching and at the same time delicate sympathy with our fellow-man, that we do not need ardent personal friendship or fine-tuned love (yet both Lenin and Engels, incidentally, called for love to be more finely tuned). These voices are harmful, this is a damaging deviation, this is dessication of man's consciousness, automatising of man, bringing him closer to the machine, this is Fordism, not Marxism, it is the ideal of the USA, not of the USSR.

That is why elements of fantasy, of dreaming, into which young organism pours its needs, its ideas of what it would want to be and what it ought to be, provide an excellent opportunity for educating the finest possible system of reflexes in a human being. One must always remember that not only those reflexes which end in action are decisive and important; one must remember that without knowledge of those reflexes, not productive of external realisation and called by the names of thought, feeling and desire (or in their generality by the old term "psychology"), one cannot

know a human being. And unless that inner or outwardly unexpressed world is to be brought into some kind of order, that human being cannot be educated. That is why we consider that children's imaginative work, both in drawing and in oral and written story, is an important element in education, which must increase and develop correctly as the child grows older and passes through adolescence.

One last point. A society's richness in respect of culture is determined by unity in multiplicity. That society is poor in which all people resemble one another like bricks in a wall, and equally poor is that in which they are all separate, facing all ways like a heap of spillikins. That society is rich, within which every individual has traits entirely its own and gives other individuals what it alone can offer, under conditions of infinitely varied and very close interaction between individuals. Socialism is a totality of uncommonly variegated, complex, freely united, unrepeatable individuals, united in the last resort into one humanity—that maximally variegated, maximally harmonious, fully self-knowing and happy whole.

Thus the school must not repress individuality, but neither must it allow parts to be cut off from the whole. Its aim is the creation of a social individuality, of what one might call socially educated originality. And the art of the word, more than any other aspect of school life, can be a means towards this education of individuality linked in harmony with the other individualities that surround it.

I am very well aware that the pessimists and the sceptics will say: "What is the use of all these words—maybe correct, certainly ardent—about the poverty of our school?" But the pessimists and the sceptics are wrong.

Firstly, we already have no small number of schools in which what I am speaking of could be realised in practice even now. And secondly, we are moving ahead rapidly. If on the school front we did perhaps find ourselves for a time in a backwater, out of the current of our great river, now its rushing flow has broken down the barriers blocking our way and will in the very near future sweep the whole sphere of people's education into its mighty forward current. We must be prepared for this.

Up to now we have often been developing our educational ideas on too poor and scanty a practical basis, up to

now we have been obliged to carry our good intentions out on the most modest of scales and to a beggarly realisation. There is no doubt whatever, though, that soon our school system, colossal in its size and extent, will suddenly emerge from its somewhat torpid state and begin to grow, teachers and pupils alike, with magical rapidity. And then watch out or it will be our educational thinking that may lag behind, tailing along after a life that has overtaken it.

I would ask my readers to pay heed to that last remark, especially as regards aesthetic education in school.

SOCIOLOGICAL PREMISES OF SOVIET EDUCATIONAL THEORY

1. Sociology and Its Significance for Educational Theory

Sociology as the theory of social life is related to questions of education as to an object to be studied.

Education of the people—its aims, its forms, its extent—of course depends upon the social system, upon general social processes, and Marxist sociology can demonstrate how public education corresponds fully to the social whole within which it develops and which it serves.

But for us, Marxists, sociology is not only an objective, inductive science, shedding light on a given body of material by means of unifying principles. For us, Marxists, theoretical sociology is an essential tool, it is the supporting foundation from which our practical sociology arises. For in this field more than in any other, Marx's words to the effect that others have interpreted the world in various ways but that we have come to change it,¹ are full of meaning.

From this point of view we must at all times not only assess the state of education, not only trace it back to its natural roots, but also show the deep divide that exists between those forms of education which have been dictated by the interests and the will of ruling classes, and the education which would be in the interests of the oppressed masses.

We can set ourselves an even more far-reaching task. We can demonstrate, taking as our point of departure the general programme of the proletariat (Socialism, Communism), our general ideas and the advantages—which are in all respects beyond all comparison—of the system towards which the proletariat is striving, and lastly, the full accord of our educational principles with a correct advance towards those objects—we can demonstrate that the new educational theory elaborated by the proletariat should be seen as the victorious opposite of the old theory not only because it is in the interests of the proletariat but because it is in

the interests of the development of humanity as a whole.

On this exceptionally important coincidence—important especially from the educational point of view, especially for the teacher—of class aims with common human aims, quite clear statements have been made by Marx, by Lassalle, and by others among our great teachers.

On all occasions a revolutionary Marxist approaching the problems posed by bourgeois educational theory must not only provide their explanation in nature but also offer a critique and an alternative educational theory flowing from the principles of socialism. This becomes an absolutely essential task for Communists after attaining power. The sociologist in power is of course a statesman; he is—of course—a destroyer of the old and builder of the new; he is—of course—a fighter and a creator.

From this standpoint it is clear that our educational sociology assumes a profoundly practical character, that it must move rapidly from statement of general principles to their realisation in practice, and must take account in doing so of all the difficulties along the way; must remember that it is not possible to achieve complete transformation of the educational system at a stroke, must map out the most acceptable traditional forms and take care, too, that the various educational and scientific institutions should not get stuck fast in these transitional forms but should progress in step with the general expansion of socialist development.

2. The Unified School as a Reflection of the Principles of Soviet Democracy

Looking at public education as it has taken shape in the countries of dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, we note first of all the division, on principle, of the school into several levels, and the more or less complete removal of ladders whereby there might be upward movement from the lower to the higher levels. This is not only anti-socialist, it is anti-democratic.

From the standpoint of proclaimed equal political rights the countries of bourgeois democracy—"democracy" in quotes, of course—should be obliged to provide equal right

to equal education for at least all children of equal ability. But bourgeois democracy is continually eroded owing to the complete contradiction, so vividly noted by Marx, between supposed political equality and actual economic inequality.² The school system of the countries of Western Europe and of America is marked much more deeply, even so far as actual school structure is concerned, by economic inequality than by juridical and political equality.

Proclamation of the principle of the unified school is from this point of view not only a natural principle of socialism being put into practice, but also a crowning act of democratic reform. The unified school, equal educational opportunity, is in essence also a last link in the bourgeois revolution as well as a first link in the socialist revolution, like for instance nationalisation of the land or equality of the sexes in political rights.

Of course we may be told that this unification has been realised here only in principle. Lenin was fond of saying, with a rather wicked smile, that realising or accepting something "in principle" meant one was a very long way from realising or accepting it in practice. And so it is. Equality is one of the basic principles of Communism. According to the definition of Socialism given by Lenin, it represents the almost complete realisation of equality (equal remuneration for equal work).³ But we, who are on the way towards this Socialism with its high but varying remuneration of labour—a sort of allowance received from society in the form of consumer goods against the contribution made to society in work, or labour—we are still far from anything like the outward expression of true economic equality. Of course we have no millionaires, we have no exploiters on a large scale, but differences in property, and even more in ways of life, are still great. One of the principal barriers dividing people one from another is the difference between town and country. It will still of course be a long time before the countryside ceases to lag behind the town, and especially in point of enjoyment of cultural advantages.

All this leads to the situation that while there is acceptance in principle of the unified school and equal educational opportunity, (at least for children of equal ability), in actual fact the town child enjoys greater advantages than

the country child. It is much easier for the former to complete four-year schooling, or seven-year, or nine-year, than it is for someone living in the countryside. We know too that in both town and country we still cannot, in spite of all our efforts, even out educational opportunities as between the poor and groups that are better off. In practice, poor people's children in the country cannot even manage four classes in our elementary school, in practice it is rare for poor people to be able to see their children through a full course at second-stage school, and so on. But if we turn our attention to the fact that in our institutions of higher education workers and peasants, and their children, do make three-quarters of the total number of students, if we compare the class representation in our technical colleges and second-stage schools with the situation as it used to be, then we shall see that in spite of the poverty of our country and the economic inequality this gives rise to, we have none the less made a massive advance in the direction of accessibility of schooling at all levels to all people.

The norms of the universal school, with equal rights for children of equal abilities to all levels of education, must remain the definitive norms for our programme of development. Countries which economically are fully capable of realising such a school, but fail to do so out of hypocrisy, are unworthy to be called even democratic. Some democrats, the more advanced or the more cunning ones, understand this, and Herriot⁴ has twice now introduced a draft bill on a unified school into the legislative Chamber. In a conversation with me, Herriot actually indicated that he considered such a reform to be a natural part of the system of democracy. But the bourgeoisie refuses to entertain the very idea of such a reform, for it would take away one of its privileges—the privilege of having a full education.

3. The Labour Schools as Understood by Marxists

Equally within the field of democratic social life, carried through to its logical conclusions, is that which we call the labour school. True, the principle of the labour school is, sociologically speaking, more closely bound up with proletarian in particular than is that of the unified school.

In his famous, foundation-laying exposition to the First Internationale of the principle of the labour school, Karl Marx was not even speaking, as can be seen from the context, of this school being brought into existence after the triumph of the working class. He considered it as something fully realisable within capitalist society, like the eight-hour working day, equal pay for equal work for men and women, and other such demands.⁵

Marx's idea, as we all know, is in brief that properly organised apprenticeship to industrial work, at places of production, is the ideal form of education of the people.

It is immediately apparent that this form of education relies absolutely upon the factory or industrial establishment. If it is at all possible to transfer the principles of the Marxist labour school to an agrarian school, this can only be if the agrarian school is within a setting of mechanised agriculture, i.e. a school living within an atmosphere of industrialised agriculture. Marx's labour school is a deeply industrial school. In step with the industrialisation of our country opportunities will naturally appear more widely for bringing into being labour schools of the type envisaged by Marx.

But that aside, we have before us industrialised countries, we have before us America, which in respect of carrying bourgeois-democratic forms through to their conclusion has advanced quite a way, and yet one must not balk at saying that industrial education of the people in that country can only be realised in the first resort by the proletariat. Some very great efforts, quite beyond the understanding of a bourgeois government, are required in order to proletarianise, so to speak, the education of all children, even those not belonging to the working class. In this sense Marx's form of labour school is not only a logically final form of democratic industrial school, but specifically a profoundly proletarian industrial school. It is significant that Marx speaks of a member of the proletariat, educated on the basis of industrial apprenticeship understood and organised as he meant, being able very soon to outstrip the children of the bourgeoisie educated in their *lycées* and colleges.⁶

We in our country, comparatively little industrialised, with our extremely backward agriculture, can bring Marx's

school into being only, in essence, in the Works Apprentice Schools (*fabzavuchi*), and there only to the extent to which shortage of funds and resources does not compel us to curtail general and political education, and physical training too severely. Marx considered those things to be of very great importance. The tendencies noticable today among some of the people involved in industry, to view the Works Apprentice Schools solely from the point of the current needs of this or that industrial establishment, have thrown even our vanguard contingent of schools back to the level of American-type apprentice training.

It is obvious that for other schools, those for urban children not of proletarian origin, and country schools—whether elementary schools or the Schools for Peasant Youth—we are obliged to bring in substitutes for industrial work, i.e. either work based on a craft or peasant economy, or excursions to an area of major industry and industrialised agriculture, or textbooks and curricula appropriately written, based on living reality and aiming to fill in as far as possible, through verbal explanation and visual aids, the enormous gap which arises from the fact of labour itself being, here, on a low average level of skill. The school cannot be organised on the high level required, as a specifically *labour* school, if labour itself is not on a sufficiently high level in the country as a whole.

It is clear from the above that, from the sociological aspect, we are entitled to call our school a unified and a labour school, and are bound to strive towards that state for it, in exactly the measure and to exactly the extent to which we are entitled to call our economy a socialist economy and must strive to advance it towards a fully socialist type.

4. Participation of the School in the Life of Society

Of exceptional importance is the idea of the school taking part in social life and socially useful labour—an idea strongly stressed by Lenin, and one closely connected with the school being qualified as a labour school.

There is of course no essential reason why even in bourgeois-democratic countries children should have to be confined to scholastic learning in school itself. But the well-

known educationist John Dewey, who happens to be a supporter of the labour school, in particular the school involved in the life of society, declares in his book *Schools of Tomorrow* that even in America he knows of only eight or nine schools which could be called satisfactory in this respect.⁷

We, with our far-reaching desire to draw young people in as early as possible to participation in the intense and seething life of our society, we attribute immense significance to the link-up of school and its surrounding environment. I shall not dwell on this now, but only note that this is not a matter of simply "taking part", of the school as it were being trailed along on a tow-rope behind life outside the school, and never breaking away from it. No, we consider that given our low level of health education and economic knowledge, and political knowledge too to some extent, in the villages, the backward towns and among the backward sections of the population in the large towns, the school can from the first take up a position which stimulates social activities and contributes to it. For this we have no need to turn to America, where the schools are already working along these lines so far as agriculture is concerned, as Professor Tulaikov,⁸ who visited America a few years ago, has written. We need only look at the work of our money-starved Schools for Peasant Youth. These schools, pitifully poor in material resources, have brought into being among the youth and older children an uncommonly powerful thirst for action directed towards making husbandry prosper around them. And these Schools for Peasant Youth, despite their material poverty, are all along the line succeeding in winning for themselves the status of centres of agrarian education in their areas. It is worth directing your attention to the First Experimental Station⁹ under the Commissariat for Education, in Kaluga province (see Vol. II of the *Educational Encyclopaedia*) and to the successful efforts by the school there to help health and hygiene through various partial reforms of agricultural practice in the surrounding villages, and to contribute towards the growth of political awareness there.

Lenin's slogan that children and young people should, while still studying, take part in the general creative work

of society, be it in the simplest and smallest of ways remains our great device.¹⁰ The bourgeoisie, which could put it into practice, passes by on the other side, because it fears the development of the social spirit among the children of the lower orders, since along with it the spirit of criticism—of the rule of the bourgeoisie—also develops.

5. Sociological Bases for the Content of Labour School Education

Passing on to the matter of the inner content of school learning, we must note, again from the sociological standpoint, the following phenomenon. Of course the bourgeoisie, the class in the position of hegemony within a society highly developed in point of things economic, had to solve both in scientific theory and in practice a great number of extremely big problems in science and technology, and this is the cause defining the immense success of capitalism.

It would be mere stupidity on our part were we to forget the colossal scientific and technological discoveries made by the bourgeoisie or under its leadership, which now represent such immense might in the hands of the bourgeoisie of America (and of other countries to a lesser degree). Of course we must learn from the bourgeois countries, from the West, because in point of technology and of the whole vast mass of knowledge associated with it, we are at a much lower stage.

But the bourgeoisie remains on the level of objectively honest and triumphantly successful science only so long as the triumph of the scientific point of view does not come into conflict with the interests of the bourgeoisie. That is why, as soon as science—based on correct observation of facts and broad generalising deductions from these—entered into sociology, the bourgeoisie recoiled from such a real, scientific sociology. The real, scientific sociology—Marxism—demonstrated that capitalism is a passing phenomenon, it foretold the death of capitalism, it indicated the inevitability of the triumph of the proletariat, and the uncommonly fertile consequences that would follow that triumph. The bourgeoisie could not recognise a science such as that, it rejected Marxism, it whistled up and set upon Marxism a

whole pack of venal or semi-venal professors, who were supposed to prove that truth was a lie and lies—truth. More than that: from fear of the new sociology, which at once became a proletarian science, since tomorrow belongs to proletariat, the bourgeoisie hastily started to revise many chapters in biology, in the theory of knowledge, in the premises and conclusions of general philosophy, and everywhere began to introduce falsifications which to a large extent poison and distort the aspect of these major sections of science.

If the progressive bourgeoisie balks at poisoning the minds of children directly by inculcating religious superstitions in school (and even on this one can note a deep reaction setting in), it still remains a past-master at inventing semi-religious, idealist, metaphysical poison for the same purpose.

Clearly, in the school of developing socialism we must not only cleanse knowledge of all non-materialist impurities, but as a good half of the science taught must bring in the true science of man and society, Marxism. The school, indeed the whole system of popular education, has as its aim not only the inculcation of appropriate knowledge, but the education or "bringing out" of the human being also.

6. Social Environment and the Socialist School

Those who say that the rising generation is educated by life itself, by the whole social system, are quite right. This is sociologically correct. But there, we have already said that Marxist sociology does not admit direct, passive assertion—"social life is thus and thus, therefore its result will show up in the nature of the rising generation so and so".

The revolutionary Marxist does carry out analysis of his environment, with the greatest possible care and objectivity, but he does so in order to act upon that environment as powerfully as possible.

In this initial period of the economic and cultural struggle for socialism, life is very patchy. Alongside progressive elements it includes within itself many elements that are dubious or even bad. As a rule it is far from leading a

child educatively in a direct line towards becoming the type of Socialist we should like, a fighter for Socialism. No, life jerks the child about, as one might say, it throws him to the right and to the left, even backwards, sometimes. This makes the effect of life chaotic. It reflects the shortcomings of the past that are to be observed in family life, which is sometimes half of it structured according to the *Rules for the Regulation of the Household* of olden days, or sometimes half wrecked and swept away by the whirlwind of the Revolution, and many other things too are reflected in "life itself".

Regrettably, the school itself with its teachers who may sometimes happen to be of the old type, with its poverty, with its not yet fully elaborated teaching methods, etc., often is little better than the life outside it for truly educational purposes. But this should not be so. The school, as an educative institution of the state, must become filled with the new spirit sooner than is the case with the life of society in general, it must rise above the petty things of daily living, from it must come the truly educative forces. The school must correct the distortions forced upon the child by life.

7. The Children's Movement and the School

Since in our country, petty-bourgeois, so far as the major part of the population is concerned, the school still bears the traces of the abject poverty only recently left behind us, it has been very slow to move in the direction of becoming an instrument of socialist education, and life brought forward another means of educational influence. The Party, having created young cadres for itself within the Young Communist League (Komsomol), has now reached out lower down the age-scale. It has extended its roots into the hearts of children, it has brought into being a vanguard organisation for children—the movement of *Oktyabryata* and the Young Pioneers.¹¹ None can doubt that, even granting all the incompleteness of this as an instrument of education so far, it is a very powerful lever. Nor can anyone doubt that the higher the type of school we achieve, the more natural it will be for that school to have profound effect, being as it is a state institution di-

rected towards the all-round education of the general mass of children, or that the influence of the children's vanguard that has set itself, under the leadership of the Young Communist League, to perform the same task, will also be profound.

8. The Teacher and His Task

Lastly, it is quite clear now that the teaching profession as a body has to a significant extent made a shift away from old traditions; becoming by degrees more and more caught up by the enthusiasm of the October Revolution, it has begun to do great things in "re-training for new skills", as they say. None the less, particular emphasis must be given, in noting such a striking revolution within the school, to the process of creating a new teaching body, and hence to the importance of correct work in teacher-training establishments, at both secondary and higher-education level. I shall not touch, in this article, upon such tasks as the immense need for us to evolve a new intelligentsia of workers and peasants. This must be educated in such a way as to be at least the equal, in actual knowledge, of the West European intelligentsia—that caste of faithful retainers of the ruling bourgeoisie—and yet to feel itself still part of the mass of workers and peasants.¹² This is indeed one of the extremely vital tasks of our construction work, as was stressed by our great teacher Lenin.

The Marxist teacher is a figure very typical for the Marxist sociologist in general. The Marxist teacher cannot stir unless he is sociologically educated, without taking sociological considerations into account, he needs these things as much as he needs to know about teaching methods, etc. But at the same time the Marxist teacher must never be passive in face of circumstance, explaining away various shortcomings in the world around him—including those of the school and of his own work—as being due to such and such causes. He must not be a "tailist", trailing along behind and saying "So what can you do... how can you help..." No, the Marxist teacher is an *educator*, i.e. someone who is forming the future, and must be a factor in that future to a very great extent, not just a product of the past and the present. Let him, or her, remember that.

EDUCATION OF THE NEW MAN *

Up to now, successfully or unsuccessfully—and to a considerable extent unsuccessfully, because our means in no way correspond to our plans and our wishes—we who work on the educational front have concerned ourselves with the organisation of instruction. It may perfectly well be objected against us that the matter of instruction, in the mass first-stage schools and in the higher-level schools—the Workers' Faculties, technical colleges and universities and schools of higher learning—leaves much to be desired. But we can answer as follows: of course, to the extent that our country is still poor, that the resources set aside for the people's education are small, to that extent the results also, naturally, are far from satisfactory. But insofar as a correctly constructed plan, a correctly indicated direction can have a general effect upon the matter of instruction, given a certain paucity of resources, to that extent these factors have had their effect, and we do not for one second retreat from the general positions which have provided the foundation for our work. We consider that we have laid down quite correctly the basic directive lines on instruction, that we have a correct approach to this question, and that we know what we need to do in the field of instruction. And if a new wave of resources, both financial and human, comes our way, our mill will start working as it should.

Since the time when we recognised the impossibility of realising in our country a correctly organised, polytechnical labour school¹—and this proved impossible owing to the weak development of industry in the country—we have done a great deal of work on the question of how to transfer our original plan to more modest rails, how to cut it down but still create a school as close as possible to the type sketched out by Marx, a school which might at least

*Abridged.—Ed.

pass muster as a school of the transitional period. As a result of the work done on these questions, we have introduced our own comprehensive method,² a method which has now been introduced in the Austrian schools, is being introduced in some German schools, and is being evolved in America, where the initiatory pressure to study it in practice came from John Dewey himself.³ At the present time a big commission, of 30 most eminent American educationists, is on its way here in order to gain acquaintance with our system of instruction. All this is indicative of the fact that, so far as theoretical position at least is concerned, the State Schools Council's curricula have aroused enormous interest in the progressive teaching world, have won a leading place there.

A modest exhibition on education which we sent to Denmark is now being asked for by one country after another, it is having in Europe a greater success than we could have expected.⁴ It appears that our model schools, the comprehensive method and the use made of the basic propositions of the SSC curricula, have attained such a level that, given the crisis in education in the West, they represent a factor that cannot be denied consideration.

Teachers know, of course, what an immense crisis the schools of Western Europe are going through at present. In all the countries of Western Europe all the questions of the system, methods and content of education are being posed in an entirely new way. What one may call a state of mutation on a world scale has set in in the educational worlds of Europe and America. And here the words we have uttered play a prominent part, even in countries where Social Democrats play a leading part, and not just on methodology, but even on the content of what is taught. In Austria, Vienna in particular, the schools are as you know under Social-Democratic influence, and much that is accepted here in the teaching field has found its reflection there.

But so far as education in the broad sense is concerned, things are not good with us.

Over the last two or three years, at any and all meetings of workers that I have attended, working-class parents—both fathers and mothers, but especially the latter—have come forward with grave accusations against our schools.

They say the schools neglect their role as educators rather than mere instructors, they say their children are growing up hooligans, that they are undisciplined and impossible to cope with; the workers say the children are not at all what we would wish our future citizens to be. The schools, they say, do not know how to keep them in hand, and in place of strict discipline and collective spirit the children are developing an individualistic and half-hooligan tendency.

Alongside this, the Young Communist League recently laid before the collegium of the People's Commissariat for Education a very meaningful, deeply thought-out memorandum, which draws attention to a whole series of negative phenomena in our schools, chiefly in the higher-level schools,—to a growth of sexually permissive attitudes, to the existence of secret organisations, usually starting out from childish play-acting at conspiracy, but later leading on to disgraceful activities of various kinds, and sometimes to counter-revolutionary activity. This memorandum compels one to some very hard thinking. It would seem that our school pupils are as yet lacking, to a certain extent, care and attention so far as their moral education by the state is concerned, that their private lives, their intellectual and moral growth, are not being brought into any sort of order by the schools, and that young people are seeking ways of organising themselves outside of the schools, often falling in the process into involvements fraught with extreme unpleasantnesses, or even quite ruinous to themselves.

Besides these symptoms, I have been astounded by the utterances of some teachers. Here in Moscow we have had a whole number of cases where teachers, faced with disciplinary problems, have come out in favour of so-called "stern measures", producing the devil knows what by way of argument. In one journal for teachers I read an article which speaks of the terrible state of discipline in schools both in Western Europe and here in the Soviet Union, an article whose content one can only characterise as the romance of the rod: we find a portrait drawn there of an apparently approved type of Soviet pedagogue who sends his pupil into the woods to cut the birch with which he is later to be flogged. To read such stuff in one of our own, Soviet journals is enough to burn one up with shame. If such

declarations are possible in the central organ of the trade union of education workers, then even worse can be expected in places left much to their own devices, and far from our eyes. We have of course already taken some steps to make it clear how inadmissible such utterances are.

All this undoubtedly bears witness to the fact that we have fallen behind, excessively and absurdly far behind, in the matter of moral education, while concentrating all our attention on instruction. True, we could not have done otherwise, since there was no possibility of carrying through the reform of instructional education and at the same time issuing directives on moral education that would measure up to the demands of our revolution.

All these disturbing facts have compelled us to raise our voice now about a turning-point of sorts in our work, which would bring matters of moral education into the forefront. That is one aspect of things.

Another aspect concerns the economy.

You are aware that since proclamation of the slogan of industrialisation and of the other slogan which at the 15th Congress was its complement—of furthering by all possible means the growth of collective husbandry in the countryside—since then we have entered upon a period of serious, uncommonly concentrated work to improve our energy supplies.

We have immense reserves of raw materials, and the most progressive, most creative form of government. But from the tsarist government, which was incapable of directing those resources, devoid of skill and rapacious—we have taken over a country that has been through an imperialist war and a civil war, and that is in a state of extreme ruin and disintegration on a vast scale. Our task consists in yoking together the creative energy of the proletariat and its party and government with those great resources of raw materials, in such a way as to produce our rapid movement ahead.

As you know, enormous funds have been set aside for this purpose. We have been able to throw many thousands of millions into the business of capital construction. And today, when we have a great upward movement in the economy, the thing that the Commissariat for Education, whose

special business it is to look after the people's upward cultural movement, the thing that it has constantly been talking about has now become clear to those in charge of economic matters; that is, that the sums expended on capital construction, on mechanising the country, can truly lead to beneficial results only if there is simultaneous cultural rise among the masses, that is a rise in the knowledge and skills of people. Without this simultaneous rise in level of human qualification, no machines and no capital construction can yield anything whatsoever.

The genius of Lenin foresaw this long ago, he long ago said that a higher level of culture among the population, added to Soviet power, would give us all that was needed for socialist construction. And to that he immediately added, "but that higher level of culture won't descend from heaven upon us, it has to be bought, and our country is poor—that means that our budgetting must be done in such a way that the economy shall make available, as it grows and becomes better ordered, ever-increasing sums for the purpose of training the kind of people required".⁵

If any of you has read, in the fourth issue of *On the Road to the New School*, the article by Valentina Kordes entitled "What Youngsters Want from School Today, and What Kind of School They Would Wish to See in the Future"—you may have found an interesting passage there. A boy is imagining the school of the future. He says that in the future schools will be mechanised. Instead of a teacher there will be a programmed electrical machine; a machine for keeping order and educating the young will walk the classrooms and instil discipline mechanically. "In the laboratories the pupils are working diligently. The duty machine goes round them." After this naive picture of the mechanisation of school the author of this plan adds, "But I should not like to live then, because then there will not be people, just machines."

Of course that is not our ideal. It may perhaps to some extent be the ideal of the further development of capitalism, which is putting the emphasis more and more on obedient mechanisms, and attempting by their aid to discipline and in a certain way regulate their resistant, unquiet, rebellious material, composed of human beings—the proletariat.

The sense of socialism lies not in subjugating man to machine, but in making machines serve man. One of the basic theses of Marx and Engels is that the gigantic instruments of production, which people themselves invented while capitalist relations of production prevailed, act upon us with elemental force and cause all the bitterness and ruin of our life. Socialism, though, is the final subjection of the machines to man—the restoration of man to first place.

And if this is so, then we must in posing the question of creating a new, improved kind of people for our economy, be thinking too, of course, of all-round cultural development.

It is important to us that the sons of today's workers should be not only good production workers, able to work well with machines. For us it is important, it goes without saying, that over the period for which the dictatorship of the proletariat continues they should be real leaders in the reconstruction of life of the nations of our Union on socialist principles. For this we need broad political education, and a high level of general and specialised education, and it is to this that we must turn our attention.

These demands, made upon us and upon the whole population of the Union by the task of developing our economy, plus our understanding of how uneven and insufficient our work has been on the side of moral education, set before us the exceptionally urgent question of how to bring forth the new man—new, because for us true education means just that, the education of a new kind of human being, since the old variety, educated in a chaotic and uncultured capitalist society, is unsatisfactory.

What accusations have we to bring against the old kind of human being?

We say: society was anti-human, primarily because it was roughly speaking, divided—and indeed still is—into two groups. From ancient times right up to the present day people have been divided, in various ways and under various names, into masters and slaves.

What kind of psychology is induced, in this situation, in the so-called masters, whether they be hereditary lords, established power, or men striving for democracy—the democracy which in Napoleon's words is "careers open to talent"?

What is the psychology of these predators fighting for supremacy.

The psychology induced in men who rule is that of predatory individualism. The representative of an oppressing class sees the problem only in terms of "I, my interests, my power, my success"—and by so doing he breaks apart his links with other people. He educates himself, his son, his subordinates, in the spirit of this contempt for the mass of people. Nietzsche, who augured the psychology of imperialism, of the financial oligarchy that rules today in Western Europe and in America—Nietzsche⁶ understood this very well. He said one must distance oneself, one must foster in oneself the ability to be harsh and even cruel to people not of one's own class, to treat them as muck, as the lower orders, as raw material to be worked on. This kind of attitude to the greater part of humanity is a crippling hindrance to culture, giving the latter traits of incredible narrow-mindedness, self-sufficiency, introversion.

But over and above that, the minority of rulers, of masters, finds itself in a state of constant fear. There has probably never been a time in the history of the world when that minority could rule with a quiet mind. There have been times when the panic fear of their own subjects subsided, when those subjects followed more or less willingly in the train of a class which was in full bloom, at the height of its powers, there have been times when ruling classes were in decline, and when that panic fear became the dominant factor.

At the present time anyone whose hearing is in anything like good order can easily catch that note of fear, sounding continually in the consciousness of the masters of the situation in America and in Europe. They are all in the grip of an incredible fear. In Berlin and in Paris I have had occasion to meet some representatives of the big bourgeoisie. And—quite amazing, this!—even in front of me, a Communist, they did not attempt to conceal that they were having their children educated in such a way that they should be capable of earning their bread supposing the collapse of the bourgeois order came upon them. Rich men with millions say, "Who knows what may happen? I am having my daughter learn foreign languages, shorthand and typing—then she can always earn a living." They say, "Millions are

like smoke these days—millions today, nothing tomorrow. Who can guarantee me the future, who can promise me that the order of today will endure?"

One can imagine what panic must prevail in bourgeois circles in Berlin, where 650,000 adult population voted for the Communists.⁷ That, in other words, means that Berlin is a Communist city. They must be feeling pretty rotten, all those bourgeois Berliners.

The consciousness, the type, the character, the personality, of these "masters" are all uncommonly distorted. These are maimed, psychically dented people, as far as heaven is from earth from the real image of man—calm, authoritative, energetic, proclaiming his right of mastery over nature not on his own individual behalf or on that of a small group, but in the name of all humanity.

And on the other side, in the camp of the slaves—I am not of course describing as "slaves" those people from the oppressed classes who have grown up to socialist consciousness, I am speaking of the average conformist, including the intellectual, and in part of some strata of the workers and peasants—and here too we have the human being terribly maimed. This is, firstly, a human who has been depersonalised to an uncommon extent. Here individualism is expressed in petty avarice, in the urge to grab for oneself as much as possible of the means to existence, and in a hostile attitude to any competitor, to one's neighbours of any kind. Individualism of this kind produces in this milieu a herd instinct of colossal proportions—a worship of the existing order, an uncritical acceptance of all manner of fashions and prejudices.

This depersonalisation of the crowd leaps to the eye extraordinarily clearly in Europe, much more so than here. Whereas here, for instance, even after the revolution one may still observe something of a herd instinct of this sort, it is still to a much lesser degree. But there you have people standardised to a particular pattern, improbably alike one to another and thirsting to be like one another; they fear the very thought of being unlike others in any respect, that would be not *comme il faut*, not *anständig*, one cannot allow such things. Social Democracy does not display any features to distinguish its representatives very markedly from this petty-bourgeois bog.

If you look more closely at this old type, still predominant in the bourgeois world, you will see the incredible narrowness native to it. His link with great issues is the newspaper, which he takes every day, reads indifferently and throws out. During the brief hour in which he reads his newspaper he is in contact with the rest of the world, and then he retreats again into his shell, into his Good Suit, which is as obligatory a covering for him as a shell is to a snail, and there he lives, among his narrow everyday interests. Such, speaking in general, is this old type of human being.

I should add the following point. Living in this old world is a bitter thing for a human. Of course in our time of transition life can be bitter here too. But we are on the road, and our sufferings are the pains of creation, but there the sufferings are ordained forever, and there is no sign of anything better coming. On the contrary, over all looms the inscription "So it was, so it shall be", and in consequence—*lasciate ogni speranza*, abandon all hope.⁸

We have to make sense of the world. The world is indeed great, beautiful and full of variety, but it has no general sense of its own, and there is no one available to impart this sense, to impart rationality and justice to existence, except you and me.

The proletarian, of course, is a transitional type between the old and the new. The proletarian is the only human being, and his collective self is the only social force, capable of organising the progressive forces of humanity to break that world of masters and slaves. A proletarian, it is well-known, means nothing single-handed; he becomes a force, and a force of world dimensions, only in the mass. It is so at the point of production, it is so in trade union struggle, it is so in political struggle also.

The proletariat acts as a mass, mass presence is essential to it, and capitalism itself, with its organised mass production, educates it along these lines. A locomotive built in a works is not made by Ivan or by Sidor—it is made by a group in association and rationally organised. Thus the basic traits of the human of the future are laid down in the proletariat.

The proletariat, a class which has suffered exploitation and has no urge to exploit others, represents an active prin-

ciple capable of carrying through the reorganisation of society in an organised, planned, and collective way. And in doing this the proletariat does not feel itself to be a citizen of any one country in particular; it has assimilated the idea that it can win only in struggle on a world scale, it has acquired an internationalist spirit.

These are the traits which make the proletariat capable of leading humanity into the world of the future.

But the proletarian, none the less, is a transitional type.

If you look at him more closely, you will see that not all of the proletariat take part in the movement of the proletarian vanguard, that there is a part of the proletariat which lags behind, which comes close to and overlaps with the petty bourgeoisie, that so far as family life is concerned, and a whole number of other particular features too, almost every proletarian bears dark stains on his character and personality, stains that make him kin to the old world. Consequently he, in working upon others, must also carry through a great work upon himself.

Marx said that the period of social revolution would be a prolonged one—of several decades, and that the proletariat would, in changing the whole world, change itself too. We must keep this thesis firmly in mind, in approaching the question of education as the improvement of man.

We know that revolutions result from definite social circumstances, that human society develops according to certain laws. But the realisation of socialism is, as Engels put it, a leap out of the realm of necessity, where elemental laws rule man, into the realm of freedom,⁹ i.e. the realm of man's self-determination—not individual, but collective; this will come about not by an announcement being made, on such-and-such a day and at such-and-such a time, that "Right, lads, it's socialism now!"—and straightaway elemental laws will stand repealed, and man will begin to rule himself. No, this process lasts for decades, and means *the organisation of human wills*. The chief reason why man is in dependence upon elemental forces is that the multitude of human wills is exerted contradictorily, that human society is something like matter in a gaseous state—each man-molecule surging to this side and that, bumping into all its neighbours, rushing to and fro in disorder. To organise these molecules, to give them a single direction, to give

them purpose and order—that is what is needed. And when human wills are organised into a unity, when they act like a coordinated bundle of energy, then there will perhaps be nothing that can resist them, not even the elemental laws of nature. We already know the extent to which man, himself far weaker than these natural forces, is able to operate them like a railwayman switching the points, turning them by a sometimes quite minimal expenditure of his own energy, and giving an entirely different direction and character to their development. We cannot foresee a limit to the effect of man on nature, the point when they cease to fight against one another and emerge as a single organised force. What we will then have will be a rapidly progressing and increasing power of unbelievable significance.

Our Soviet organisation, our Party organisation, our state with its culture and its endeavour to build socialism, represent a certain stage upon that road. It is, of course, one of the earliest stages, we still have here a great deal of that internal struggle and internal chaos, we are still far from being a truly correctly organised collective. But we must strive towards such organisation, and we do have certain ability of organised, conscious action upon the elemental forces of society.

Inasmuch as we are talking about the creation of a new man, it is absolutely clear that from the point of view of *conscious influence upon the educative process* it is our schools that stand before us as one of the main tasks. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin used to say that it was in just that arena, the schools, that we should transform the old world. Many people took the attitude that these were merely words of courtesy addressed to the First Congress of Workers in Education.¹⁰ Nothing of the kind. The final victory will indeed belong to the schools, and the first real sketch-plan of a socialist society will be the socialist school. That is why quite special attention must be paid to the schools.

Our schools are poor; they have at their disposal the old body of teaching staff, the best section of which is striving to transform itself into something new, but on the one hand it is no easy matter to change oneself, and on the other, it is only the best section that is trying to do so, while the other, the worse section, and quite a considerable one, is not even trying. We are working to produce a new type of

teacher but in a poverty-stricken way, laying out copper coins only. Under such conditions one cannot be surprised at the enormous shortcomings still inherent in our schools.

To the question, "Are our state schools structured in such a way as to ensure education of the rising generation in the spirit of socialism?", we can reply that we have certain pre-conditions for doing this, certain achievements to our credit, certain partial successes. One should not think that it is possible to build up the schools in a new way immediately, in a society which is in many respects still the old society. To do so requires a big struggle, it requires creation of a new teaching body, and it requires the allocation of resources in very large quantities.

The stream of humanity flows on, a murky and muddied, stinking stream, but a mighty one for all that. It flows on through the generations, and new generations take in the experience of the old, they stand on the shoulders of the old, they take over everything of value that has been accumulated by many thousands of generations, but at the same time they take over prejudices, and sicknesses, and vices—all the dirt, all the murk and stink. Somewhere a filter needs to be set up, a net, which will let through all that is valuable, the whole mighty stream with all its skills and achievements, but which will not let through the dirt and the stink. Only the schools can be such a filter.

The teacher is the person who must pass on to the rising generation all the achievements accumulated through the ages, and not pass on the prejudices, vices and ills. That is the measure of the teacher's importance. So give him great resources, realise that it is by his hands we must cherish the healthy shoots for whose sake we struggle, for whose sake we exist, and without which life and struggle would not be worth while. This is the most important thing there is in all our struggle.

This realisation is not here yet. It must come. Only then will it be possible to form the new man.

I do not intend to say that the schools are the only, absolute and dominant means of forming the new man. I understand very well that the children's and youth organisations are a factor of no less importance.

I shall not speak about the Komsomol [Young Communist League]; it can speak for itself. In the recent period I have

formed the impression that the members of the Komsomol have at least moved up closer to the Party level, that they, the new generation, have drawn level with us, to say the least, and are perhaps even beginning to move ahead of us. We have there tremendous numbers of talented people, a remarkable combination of strikingly sober realism—the realism of adult people—with great reserves of youthfulness and great practical idealism. A fine generation!

The members of the League know their own shortcomings very well, and look to them very well. But the Pioneer movement—that is another matter: the Young Communist League has enough ability to look after its own matters, but may not have enough left over to cope with the Pioneers too, and the Pioneers, of course, cannot manage by themselves. This organisation for children has recently been in a clearly enfeebled state, we are not finding the way to give it an inner content which would not be too tiring for the children (and we do tire them too much), which would really be of lively interest to them and draw them on into the atmosphere, the crucible, where a human being is truly re-cast into a new mould. It is an immense task. The forces of the People's Commissariat for Education and the forces of our teachers should be drawn into it to a much greater extent. We need to pay immense care to our children's organisation, for the schools, given their poverty and the out-of-date attitudes of a large portion of the teachers, cannot without the help of a progressive children's organisation fulfil their task—to provide an education for a new generation.

What sort of a word is this "education"? * In all languages—*Bildung* in German, *education* in English, etc., it is linked with the idea of the child being led on to a goal, and being formed in accordance with given ideals. In the process of education the child is the raw material, the substance which must be given a certain form, which must be shaped. You understand perfectly well that humans have no predetermined universal form to work to—each class forms its child according to its own class ideals. And that is why *the concept of education is a profoundly class-determined concept*; the education of a knight, the education of a bour-

*As noted in an earlier article, the Russian word for education is *obrazovaniye*, which literally means "formation".

geois, the education of a proletarian, are quite different things.

The concept of education embraces two elements—instruction and moral training.

When I read a lecture in Berlin on the fundamentals of our educational system (the chair was taken on this occasion by Löbe, the President of the Reichstag,¹¹ I said that our schools had overcome the individual and social contradictions, whereas Western schools inevitably fall into one abyss or the other of these two. You say that the school should sharpen a human being's teeth and claws, so that he can make a career for himself, that the school should give him everything he needs for the making of a career (this is the standpoint taken by the liberal school), or you declare, along with Foerster, that a human being ought to be educated with the aim of his serving his country, that he should be prepared always to sacrifice himself for its sake, and therefore what should be developed in him is not the ability to make a personal career, but the instinct of subordination.

We do not need "patriotism" of that sort; we say, "Look, this is the state in which humanity finds itself, this is why, in spite of the progress of science and technology, it suffers unhappiness, and this is what needs doing in order to make it happy." And we say straight out to the pupil in our charge that if he wants to feel himself worthy, to feel himself a real man, to attain happiness, then a great change is needed, and to achieve that discipline is needed, agreement is needed, and for that organisation is needed, and organisation on a world scale. And would you believe it, as I said this my words were drowned in a storm of applause, yet among my audience there was not a single Communist, and probably even very few Social Democrats. This was clear evidence of the depth and correctness of our ideas; it would seem that our argumentation cannot be countered, for it is logic, and there is nothing you can do against that.

In the matter regarding the stress to be laid on the concrete or the generalised and universal, only we with our dialectical materialism have the right approach.

We are realists, we demand real, concrete work. In any given field or trade one must be a specialist, one must be a master of that trade. We hate empty word-mongers, we

hate people who look at things superficially, we need real workers and we demand real work, we demand careful consideration of the real circumstances of every task set.

But with us even the very least of tasks fits into goals of colossal significance. You could say that sweeping a factory yard, picking up an old brick or a piece of glass that is lying around, is the most modest of work. With us it assumes a world-wide importance, with us it partakes of the nature of our economic advance, which is the key to world revolution. When a worker here stands at his lathe and increases his productivity, he is taking part in the great battle of darkness and light, he is laying his small weight in the scales to change the balance in favour of the victory of light. Only when work is illumined by this universal idea, only then have we the right to demand enthusiastic, concentrated work when that universal idea is present in a man's brain, when like a sun it throws its beam of light on the concrete task before the worker, and on his calloused hands at work.

That is why dialectical materialism with its victory over particular contradictions is indeed the principle which in education, as in all else, gives us immense opportunities and lines of guidance.

One of the first problems in the education of the new man is that of physical training. Here a huge change is needed. In spite of my profound conviction of the first-rank importance of physical training, in spite of the fact that in this matter much would seem to depend upon People's Commissariat for Education, we have enormous work to do here, and will probably not succeed unless we have the support of the Party, the Young Communist League, and public opinion. At the present time physical training in the schools, in the very field of bringing up the young generation, is scandalously neglected. It is a sort of ghost of the old gymnastics, sometimes even of army gymnastics, which the school graciously allows to have a tiny space in the timetable. Instead of it being the foundation for everything else, instead of the Communist teacher saying, "First of all let us see that our children are healthy, that they are strong and graceful, that they should have sun and air enough to ensure that they develop to excellence,"—instead of that we say, "How on earth can we find two hours a week in the

time-table for that confounded gym?", and we get an old sergeant in to teach our children drill. We must completely change our approach to this matter.

We must deliberately give our gymnastics a rhythmic, collective character. The collective movements which in Sokol* practice grew out of a national principle and partly too from aesthetic feeling (the beauty of many people moving in concert) must be adopted by us. These thousands of people who all together perform with the greatest precision complex and concerted movements—this is an excellent school, a materialist school of collectivism.

Collective games, collective sport with a certain competitive element, but always within the bounds of comradeship, without wild excesses and ridiculously high prizes, these must form the basis not only of our labour and social culture, but of our military culture as well. We curse war, we hate guns, we do not want to have an army, but while we are threatened we must be prepared to fight back. So the military element in our gymnastics must be given its place, and must be introduced, in appropriate forms, even for quite young age-groups.

That is how physical training should be structured, and on this system our theoreticians of physical training have worked out an excellent general curriculum. In practice it is in many cases not observed, but it must be carried through, as being an important condition for the production of the new man.

No less important is the discipline of labour. By this I mean not only labour in school as a set of lessons and as the conquest of skills in themselves difficult to acquire. That is important, but that is not the main point. I am speaking now of actual physical labour.

Physical labour has only a very small place in the schools. We worked out the principles of the universal polytechnical labour school, but from that first plan almost nothing remains. In our State Schools Council plan of work we have retained only the basic principle of the school envisaged by Marx. But in our current practical elaboration of curricula the school workshop has been quite forgotten and abandoned. There are workshops in some schools of the higher

* The Czech national gymnastic organisation.—*Tr.*

grade, but they usually play a secondary role. Thus the labour approach, the discipline of labour, have been abandoned, yet it is obvious that they would immensely increase the interest towards school. It would be very important for the children in every peasant school to learn not only reading and writing, but also some skill needed in country life—carpentry, saddlery, metalwork. The peasantry needs a colossal quantity of things, yet the craftsmen are dying out and no one is growing up to take their place. It is only very recently that permission has been given for the taking of apprentices. For this reason we have a huge crisis in regard to country crafts. Furthermore, the teaching of any labour skill gives a polytechnical character to the school, the opportunity to a well-skilled teacher of demonstrating many natural phenomena and deducing from these a whole series of laws—and this is the labour principle correctly applied.

All this we said at that happy yet also unhappy time when we were flying high, like Icarus, on the wings of our revolutionary enthusiasm. Those waxen wings melted, and we gradually descended to this sinful earth. But we should remember that we did so only in order to rise again, we have for a time lowered our demands upon the schools only in order to gain a more effective rise later.

Another vast department of education is aesthetic education. In this department we are doing practically nothing. When in the Commissariat for Education the principles for the Soviet school were first worked out, we attributed enormous importance to aesthetic education. Later, owing to lack of resources, nothing remained of aesthetic education except, in some places, singing lessons, a little theatre work or a little bit of drawing, and some realistically inclined colleagues of mine even said that all that craze for aesthetic education only came about because the people's Commissar was an eccentric—he had a weakness for art and wanted to have art in schools, but in actual fact that was a thing of tenth-rate importance only, as everyone knew—when we grew rich, then it would be time to think about art.

This kind of attitude resulted from vast ignorance. Aesthetic education is a factor of immense importance in education as a whole, not only because it is a nice thing to develop this or that artistic ability in a pupil, to have him singing, playing the fiddle or doing good drawings, and not

only, as bourgeois educationists often say, to educate in the child the ability to appreciate nature and works of art, which is important because it contributes to his personal happiness.

That is not the main point. The main point is that there are almost no other ways of educating the human emotions, and consequently, the human will. Of course one should link up school with the life of society, one should use workplaces, points of production, and participation in social life, to broaden the horizons of the pupil and foster his sympathies with other people. But take good note that festivals, almost from beginning to end, consist of artistic elements. Real life as it exists is so chaotic and contradictory that it is almost impossible to use it as an aid to education; it has to be organised. And that organisation is mainly accomplished through the arts—music, literature, theatre, cinema, the pictorial arts. To the extent that works of art are either produced or appreciated by children collectively, they leave an ineffaceable mark upon the children's consciousness. That is the whole point—the genius of Tolstoy was fully expressed in the definition he gave, that art is first and foremost such an organisation of words, sounds, lines, colours, etc. as is capable of transmitting the mood, feeling, experience of their author to an audience of listeners, viewers or readers, etc.¹² The effect is produced by force of example, this is the main stimulus to imitation, and if a teacher is in no way an artist, then he is in no way a teacher. *Aesthetic power* means, first and foremost, the organisation of expressive resources in such a way that they act directly upon the feelings of men, and change those feelings. And art is the highest expression of this kind of agitational work, this way of affecting emotionally those around you. That is why art is of such immense importance—it summons up, fosters and organises the sympathies of the individual for what is around him; it makes us understand, love, hate, feel a lively reaction to the existence of other people, of animals, of things, to the past and to the future; and if we can make use of the old art for this purpose, taking from it those elements which are appropriate to our purpose, how much more ought we to want to develop our own art, which will express *our* ideas, *our* principles, *our* views, and which will be of gigantic significance educationally.

It is essential for us to introduce into our educational processes not only the elements of physical education and aesthetic education, but also elements of discipline. Man's will grows by overcoming difficulties. We cannot get children to develop by offering them only pleasures. In the future they will have to surmount obstacles, often with some effort and some suffering. For this discipline is needed, the human being must be able to keep himself in hand, to submit himself to what is unpleasant for the sake of a goal which he considers good. The highest form of discipline is self-discipline. When a man's character is firm enough, he makes himself go through hardships in order to reach his goal. But if a man has not enough will-power to do this, if he proves to have insufficient self-discipline (and this applies to adults as well as to children), then he must be helped.

The child has two sources of help: the group of his peers, the collective, and the teacher. The teacher is not desirable as a direct moral educator; it will be best of all if he works through the development in the child of the ability for self-discipline, or, if he has sufficient authority, if he becomes as it were the presiding genius of the children's collective and evokes from it the conscious discipline that serves the achievement of the educational goal. The source of discipline should be the collective. It is always better than the individual. Within a collective it is always possible to find those groupings which can provide the foundation for a certain discipline. This is the line that should be followed. Here the sense of honour must be developed.

I am not at all afraid of using this expression. Robespierre, a bourgeois revolutionary, said: "The nobility had honour, we have honesty." We, the proletarians, have honour once more. It must be a dialectical process.

The bourgeois shopkeeper who would not cheat his customer of so much as an inch when the latter was buying cloth fully deserves the name of an honest citizen.

The honour of a nobleman was of a different kind entirely. Since the nobility had major tasks of aggression to dis-charge and was a military caste, a class of conquerors, it was necessary for them that a man should be able to discipline himself, to subordinate his personality to the interests of that given class in order to make it stronger.

We are tackling vast historic problems, and the individual must be prepared to sacrifice himself to the common goals; it is not enough to be prepared to die for them—we demand more, we demand that men should live for them, and live every hour of their lives for them. Lenin said, "Make your behaviour correspond to the basic moral standards of the proletariat." And by these basic moral standards, that is good which leads to the victory of the proletariat and its ideals, and that is bad which harms that cause.

It is along those lines that we must develop the sense of honour.

The sense of honour needs to be developed from a child's earliest years. The body performing the educative function in this respect must be the collective, and if a boy or a girl has told a shameful lie, or has hindered collective work, or used force against the weaker, or shown anti-semitism, then he or she must feel shame before all their comrades for their action, as unworthy of a member of that collective. The small human must feel the blush of shame at having to admit his or her fault before the group.

That is what sense of honour means for us. It is an enormous force for discipline within the collective. If a teacher can achieve discipline of that kind, then by so doing he will achieve a great deal.

Baden-Powell, the organiser of the Boy Scouts, succeeded admirably in developing the sense of a Scout's honour in them.¹³ All the more, then, must we develop this sense in our Pioneer movement. I remember once talking to some little Pioneers and asking them: "Well, is there anyone here who smokes?". And they answered: "A Pioneer would be *ashamed* to smoke." And it was said so definitely, rapped out in such a way that you felt it meant something, that anyone smoking really would be ashamed. And shame is a power that has been built up among men over the ages, shame is the result of the demands laid down by society not being met, and it is capable of keeping a tight rein upon savage instinct, intractable as a wild animal. That is why I think we have no reason to be afraid of the word "honour", and that we need to develop this sense of corporate, class honour not only among adults but in the child too.

In working to bring forth the new man we must take earnest heed of one disgrace that still occurs in our daily life

—we still find women downtrodden. In no way shall we be able to move ahead unless, firstly, we give women the opportunity to develop themselves freely and, secondly, the family ceases to be a means of exploitation.¹⁴ Really, it is sometimes hard to find words to express one's contempt and indignation over the way some Communists and members of the Young Communist League speak on sexual questions and on attitudes to women. In this context there still lurks within many of us an exploiter of such primitive savagery that you could set such a Communist side by side with any bourgeois. Lenin was aware of this, Lenin branded it for what it is, and we now must brand it for what it is—criminal.

This makes its appearance sometimes under the guise of so-called free relations between the sexes. Men are inclined to touch up the attractions of such "free" relationships—they don't give a damn now for family life, because the family is a bourgeois institution, see?—therefore you've got to have complete freedom. The "glass of water" theory appears, i.e. the reduction of a mutual relationship to nothing but the satisfaction of a physiological need. But the children—it is the woman who has them, not the man, so that the man suffers nothing, while the woman suffers hugely.

That refers to relationships outside the family. On relationships within the family, Vladimir Ilyich with his immense clarity of vision used to stress this: we have given women equal rights, but we have not rescued them from domestic work. Of course a man can help his wife, and here a comradely attitude can achieve a good deal. But for a radical solution of the problem we must have a reconstruction of our way of living. For this reason great attention needs to be paid to the provision of new housing, of facilities for communal catering and for getting laundry done outside the home, and to getting rid of the nursery within the family, which takes up such vast quantities of physical energy.

Housework, which Lenin defined as the worst organised and the most slavish form of labour, and the most uneconomic in terms of energy expended, must be condemned to die the death; gradually, first in the towns and then in the countryside, housework must be brought to naught. This is a premise, a precondition for the building of socialism. With-

out this we shall not be able to draw vast numbers of women into the building of socialism, and we shall not truly realise equal rights for women.

We must transform our individualistic daily living into a social one. The development of the new man depends greatly on social organisation apart from factories and workplaces, and apart from life-support services. So that here the clubs should acquire immense importance for us. I will not elaborate on this point particularly, everyone now understands the importance of this aspect. We have gone a long way already in this respect, nowhere in the world has the development of democratic clubs gone forward on such an impressive scale as here, although we could still wish it to be much better.

At the same time, all our new housing construction, the whole direction of our cultural line must be such that we do not forget the individual man behind the social man. We must recognise the right of each individual person to a room of his or her own, which can be furnished according to personal requirements, where privacy can be had; also the right to have an individual family even in a socialist society where the family may not be essential; then children can be educated by society, but none the less if a couple wishes to lead a private life of their own, every opportunity should be given them to do so. One should not depict socialism as socialisation of the person to such an extent that it amounts to a kind of extritoriality—with the person completely externalised, all in full view, unable to be by himself, to live his own inner life and foster his own individuality. This is wrong. In Fülöp-Miller's book on the Bolsheviks (a huge, beautifully illustrated volume) it is said that Leninist Bolsheviks deny the right to individual development, to originality and to personal life, and that only Lunacharsky holds other views, but that he published his booklet about this in Berlin under the initials N. N., because he was afraid to put his own name to it.

Of course I did not publish any booklet under the initials N.N., but I have always openly, in speeches and in print, expressed the idea that socialism presupposes great development of the individual, rather than grinding him down and sweeping him away. Dozens of our other comrades have said the same. We have always taken the view that the in-

dividual reaches his fullest flowering under socialism, and when at the beginning of this lecture I protested against the herd aspect of the mass of the public in Western Europe, I had in mind that the structure characteristic of socialist society was "granular". Here extremely original individualities can develop, capable each of contributing something new to the general concert, as each voice in an orchestra takes its own line and all in concert sound together in symphony.

Some people ask the question, "Are we not going backwards? Do we not see symptoms of decay, of weariness?" The papers carry reports of a rape in a Moscow hostel, we know of all kinds of disorders and scandals among young people, even those within the Young Communist League. It is beyond doubt that in our higher-level schools too there are some revolting trouble-spots which prove that demagnetisation is starting, that we are regressing.

Of course there are such processes going on among us, but I maintain that they are not the dominant ones, it is not they that set the tone and determine our overall progress. But these things are there. Why? Because we live in a transitional period.

We struggle with natural forces, with our poverty, for the means to exist and to advance. We are locked in a tense struggle with the class enemy—with bourgeois elements that try to exert influence upon us insidiously; with the remnants or the hangers-on of the big bourgeoisie, that try actively to damage us; we struggle with philistinism, with lack of culture, with philistine anti-cultural attitudes; and in particular we struggle with backwardness in the countryside. This lack of culture is like a cancer that stretches out its threads and excrescences into the depths of our Party organism, to our very heart. With all of this we carry on a cruel and unrelenting struggle. In the first period of revolutionary struggle the enemy was before us, we fought him, we received wounds, many fell dead, but at that time all was there to see, all was clear. Now it is not so. History has taken another turn, and demands of us not destruction only, but creation. It has made these demands of our young people too. Do we know how to create? No, we must still study, long and hard. Yet we cannot offer the chance to study to all. From the primary schools we send on to higher

schools and to Workers' Faculties a little over half the total number, and, owing to our poverty, we leave a huge section of pupils without any further teaching—and it is these people with uncompleted education who to a significant extent find themselves unemployed. Those who are still studying do so under dismal conditions—with no textbooks, in poorly equipped premises, badly prepared for the courses they follow, and receiving a derisory grant to live on, if any at all. We should not forget how hard this colossal concentration of effort can be: to study and at the same time to respond to social obligations, since one must not lose contact with one's class, otherwise at the end of the process all we shall have will be a disorientated, declassed "technical expert" who has no links with the masses of workers and peasants. All this creates additional difficulties for students of all categories. And once a young person has at last got a job—is it always the job they want to do, may it not be thoroughly boring to the person doing it? Very often their fate may be some clerical job in an office, some purely technical routine task, the same day after day.

This sort of dissatisfaction with work, and boredom, pushes the youngster towards Bohemianism, to drink and debauchery, spiced with the thought that after all *we* are people of a higher order, we cannot go on in that old petty-bourgeois milieu, we are looking for a way out to the higher freedom and liberation from morality—and maxims of this sort are the "new testament" of the Bohemian. And in cases where they cannot rise to Bohemianism, since their education is insufficient even for that—then the progression is to plain hooliganism, vandalism, drunkenness and all sorts of idiocy, straight and undisguised; here the sot gets besotted merely because he is bored, he can't face things, because he does not feel himself a part of this society which is moving ahead, he feels himself thrown overboard and left behind.

This means, comrades, that morally and culturally we are losing no small number of people wounded or killed in each of our battles. One cannot go to a general before a battle and say, "Win this fight without anyone being killed or wounded." The same is here: we cannot go forward without losing those who have morally fallen behind.

Comradeship is a great key that opens many closed bo-

xes. To give timely support to a man who has lost balance, to set him straight, tell him off, put him up to be "sorted out" by his mates, pull him by main force out of the bog into which he is sinking—that is what is needed. We need to show care for one another. That section of the whole which is healthy and morally strong is responsible for the section which is sinking, and often sinking because they are in worse conditions.

Proclaiming the slogan "now the revolution in culture" means speeding up in the extreme the tempo of our movement forwards to bringing forth the new man. It also means a careful re-evaluation of the principles and methods we have been following up to now.

Someone who has been sitting so that a leg has gone to sleep does not feel that leg, but when he stands up he will feel pins and needles in it, because the blood has begun to circulate again. It is not an altogether pleasant feeling, but it does not mean that anything is wrong, it shows it is setting itself right. In the same way the criticism which has started to rise its voice in the field of cultural work shows that our Soviet, workers' blood is beginning to pulse here again, and that this to some extent benumbed sector of our work of construction is now getting keyed in to the general system of our mighty Soviet life.

THE EDUCATIONAL TASKS OF THE SOVIET SCHOOL *

The Socialist Revolution and the Tasks of Education

We are in the midst of a radical transformation of society. This transformation of society—the socialist revolution, the “establishment of justice on the earth”—has occupied the thoughts of men over a long period. And alongside our Marxist-Leninist thinking on the socialist revolution there has been a whole series of other trends which have also stated the facts of how unsatisfactorily society—in particular bourgeois society—was ordered, and of what an unethical, unaesthetic and imperfect being man was. I will not now go into the very interesting question of how a conception of what man ought to be, is established. I shall merely note that other social reformers (great and small, individuals and mass movements) have often supposed that the reformation of life can and should be brought about through the re-education of man, as child and as adult, through a particular teaching; a perfected man, in their opinion, is the condition for the further growth and improvement of social life.

We completely reject this viewpoint of the liberals and the utopians. We have said that within a society such as that in which we exist, the transformation of humanity by means of teaching or preaching is impossible of attainment, even if it were to be allowed by the ruling classes. Our blueprint is different: the proletariat as a class, the class left disinherited by capitalism, the class that can easily reach a grasp of the idea of union of all proletarians of the world for the purpose of rationalising the whole life and the daily existence of mankind—that class, while being itself in no way perfect, is none the less the only possible revolutionary force that can take power into its hands and compel all other forces upon the scene to submit to its will and dictates, and then proceed to the re-organisation of life. Marx

* Abridged.—*Ed.*

put it like this: the social revolution of the proletariat will take up a long period of time; for some decades the proletariat will have not only to change its environment, but to change itself; and by the end of the process, approaching the establishment of a socialist order, it will come to be a type of human being much more suited to ordering life properly than that type now in existence.

With regard to the educational process considerably reducing the time needed for the transition from a socialist to a communist formation, one can find most interesting and useful pointers in what Lenin said. Vladimir Ilyich used to stress that it would be a delusion, a fatal error, for Communists and the proletariat to think that the business of socialism is only to change formal human relationships, the laws, or to change only material relationships, starting with machines and passing on to housing conditions and affairs of daily life, but ignoring the matter of man himself. Vladimir Ilyich stressed that the work of construction which does not in itself lead to a change in man himself, is essentially lacking all aim and sense; that even from the point of view of actual successes, political and economic, to be achieved by the proletariat, the latter must straight away, immediately after taking power into its own hands, concern itself with the cultural revolution. For both the consolidation of political consciousness and, in particular, the extent of the proletariat's influence upon the peasantry and upon the working intelligentsia, depend on the level of political education and culture reached by the working masses.¹

The political education of the new generations which must take over from ours—that is not everything; economic tasks too demand, no less insistently, attention to the human factor. The re-education of adults and education of young people and children are the pre-condition for further economic and political successes, not to mention that it is they that bring about the transformation of human life which gives true meaning to the whole movement of the proletariat. In this sense, the educational process occupies one of the central positions.

Vladimir Ilyich was right when he said that our generation would be obliged to concern itself with transforming the life of man, while ourselves standing waist-deep in the dirt of old prejudices and life's uglinesses.² We are maimed

humans, we are not yet socialists; rather we see the trend that way, yet can with difficulty manage to bring our behaviour into accord with what we want.

People who have spent the greater part of their lives, or even their youth only, under the old order, have great difficulty in liberating themselves from all manner of egoism and other charming features of individualistic petty-bourgeois life.

Individual brilliant examples of what a man can be, such as for instance Vladimir Ilyich Lenin was, amaze us with their consistent integrity and harmony, something far removed from the average type even among Communists, even among proletarians. The thing to achieve is that the new generation, brought up in the surroundings of a life still not in full and proper order, should be educated as fast as possible into people with characters and habits of action, and general physical make-up, that measure up to the demands set by the socialist order of life as we conceive of it.

The process of education is still beset with difficulties, in spite of the revolution. We cannot guarantee that the next generation, that nearest of all to us, will be able to tear itself free from the old circumstances of life, since in our transitional period those circumstances are a stormy and still somewhat polluted sea, surrounding some islands or islets on which the socialist order of things is already becoming established. The difficulties of education are huge.

Of what nature, in the history of humanity or of human civilisation in general, is the process of education, what is its sense, and how is that sense being changed in our hands?

Man is distinguished from all the other animals by the role which in his case is played by socially acquired and socially transmitted experience. Over a period of five thousand years man, like any other animal, anatomically and physiologically has not changed. If one were to take a child born in, say, London in this year, and to educate him in complete isolation from the surrounding civilisation, one would produce an imperfect animal, less fitted for life than other animals, because animals enjoy a rich inheritance of instincts, which cannot be said of man. And if one compares a man in the prime of life five thousand years ago and one of the same age today, or a savage and a contemporary Englishman, then the difference is enormous.

This difference lies in knowledge, in power over nature, things acquired in the process of education, starting with the acquisition of language, the results of past civilisation, etc.

Human society holds at its disposal a huge capital, accumulated over the ages—a capital which constantly increases. And each new generation has the advantages of the still higher stage into which it comes, receiving in this way an immense heritage, not through heredity but through acquisition, which with the animals plays a quite insignificant part, but for man is everything. This creates an extremely fascinating and retentive bond between the generations. It is something like a stream of history fed by ever more and more fresh individuals, but which is itself a unity, for these individuals—through schools, libraries and the whole organisation of economic life, culture, etc., take in the old and themselves create more.

But the new arrivals in human society, the clean, fresh, recently born human material that replaces the old withered leaves, in making its own the colossal gains of the past also makes its own the diseases of the past. If a man is born in a crooked, crippled society, that society in subjecting him to its regime cripples him: all the prejudices, all the ugliness, all the shortcomings of the past are taken over by him. Each new generation not only has the advantages of the accumulated riches of the past, it also becomes infected with its diseases (I mean social diseases, not physiological ones). Our task is to set up a mighty filter in the living stream of humanity, or a prism of one sees that stream as one of light to enable the new stock of humans to arm itself with all that is positive from the creations of civilisation, but which would not let through social deformities, prejudices, sicknesses of all sorts, and which would send the human stream on its way purified.

Our schools have a dual task: on the one hand, to pass on all the knowledge won in the past, of course accenting the new culture, the new science, and first of all that which belongs to the proletariat, Marxism, proletarian organisation and our own communist ideas; on the other hand, to prevent the old ideas from reaching the child, to leave no chance of its being infected with all that we struggle against in the old society.

We need to take in the whole history of pedagogy and its present state in the world at large. But we know very well that its propositions, as a rule, have aims opposite to those which we set ourselves; at best we find there the apolitical school, the school of the "free child",³ which in no way whatsoever relates to our school with its sharply defined class character in both moral and instructional education. We have had to build up this edifice with our own hands, from top to bottom, and while suffering an extreme deficiency of material means. The pointers that have been given us by our leaders can be brought together into one very small booklet, and these we make use of, as of a compass. But a compass alone is not enough, in raising up such a grandiose edifice.

We still have insufficient means, not only for taking over the full education of all children, we have not even the means needed to build our schools to anything like a decent standard. Even our primary schools do not take in all children as yet, and the second-stage schools deal with an insignificant percentage only. We are now spending on each pupil, for his entire school life, approximately 50 per cent of what was spent in damnable tsarist Russia; we pay our teachers in primary schools 75 per cent, and in second-stage schools fifty per cent, of their insignificant pre-war earnings. That makes it clear what immense difficulties, what terrible handicaps, are facing us. No one is to blame for this, for the scanty means at the state's disposal could not be allocated in any other way.

The Aims of Education in the Period of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Instruction is inextricably bound up with moral education. Indeed the tasks of both are subsumed in the single word "education". Our word for it, "*obrazovaniye*", and the German "*Bildung*", convey the sense of the process very accurately. The child is seen as something that has not yet assumed a finished form or image, a semi-finished product as it were or a sort of raw material, and it has to be given its final form. If we want to give form to a material, we

need to start with Marx's formulation stating that the work of a man, even of an ordinary artisan, is distinguished from the work of the wisest of beavers and the most ingenious of bees, by the fact that a man has, in working, a preliminary consciousness of the aim of the work.⁴

The teaching process too is a labour process, and one must therefore know what one is seeking, what one wishes to make out of this material. If a goldsmith spoils some gold it can be re-cast. If precious stones are spoilt, they must be thrown out as scrap. But even the largest of diamonds can have no greater value, in our eyes, than a newborn human being. Spoiling a human being is either a great crime, or a case of terrible damage done unwittingly. This most valuable of all materials must be worked with utter precision, with prior knowledge of what has to emerge from the process.

What sort of human being do we want to create?

The great idealists in the field of education, who were in some degree our forerunners and to whom we are close so far as the final ideal to be achieved is concerned, set the task in the following terms: *a harmonious human being must be created*, i.e. on the one hand his needs must be developed (and satisfied), and on the other, all his abilities must be developed. And in doing this the aim must be to see that these needs and abilities are organised in such a way that one aspect does not hinder the other, that the end result should be an integrated organism, just as in building a machine we take care that one part should not interfere with another, that its overall efficiency should be as great as possible.

It has commonly been held that specialisation conflicts with this aim. I reject this, for if specialisation engrosses a man to such an extent that it destroys his humanity, then it becomes a disease, an absurdity. But if specialisation makes manifest and assists the particular role that the given individual plays in society, then it does not conflict with the ideal of the harmonious personality. A human being must receive a general education, he or she must become someone to whom nothing human is alien, but to this must be added a field of special knowledge, or several, according to the abilities present, and there is no contradiction or conflict here.

But there is conflict between the harmonious human being and this age of ours. Today we are educating for a transitional stage, for struggle, for very intense struggle, which does not provide a harmonious environment. We could reply to the ideals of the great educators as follows (and Fichte⁵ understood this): It is no use concentrating your thought on creating a harmonious human being, for that being will be living in an inharmonious society. Here there will be a collision, and its result will be either that the human has to abandon society and be a hermit (for everything in this society is going to shock him, and will prevent him realising his potential), or else he will be something like a Don Quixote, hurting himself against the sharp corners of life in society, and puzzled by problems for which he has to show qualities inconsistent with harmony.

We, of course, are not setting ourselves the task of creating hermits, not even highly-educated ones. Looking at it from the other side, a harmonious human being could not go to war. Can we at the present time prepare human beings in such a way that they will hate war in general, will have a Tolstoyan pacifist attitude? When we encounter liberal educationists, we time and again hear from them, "You want to educate children in the spirit of class hatred: one must not tell children of cruel things, one must not make children hate people; let life do that when it must, but for the time being children should be shielded from all that."

A harmonious man in a harmonious society will have no need of bloodshed or of cruelties. But if we, losing track of time and date, fail to bring up a child as a fighter and a distinct personality, then that will hinder us from creating a great deal, *it will hinder our creating the harmonious society*. Our class enemies and thousands of other obstacles have to be overcome through a highly intensive effort and struggle, and we need a man of the highly intensified motivation, of highly intensified critical faculties, capable of immense expenditure of effort and of a high degree of self-sacrifice. We bear the aims of harmony in mind for the future, but the process of struggle requires men of another kind. One must distinguish between socialism in the process of struggle and socialism already victorious. Socialism already victorious—that is a classless

society,⁶ but socialism in the process of struggle is oppressed humanity tearing its living bonds that are the living bodies and the living consciousness of its class enemies.

We want to educate the man who will be a collectivist of our time, who will live by the life of society much more than by his own personal interests. The new citizen must live in sympathy with the sense of political and economic relationships during socialist construction, must live in them, value them, see in them the aim and the content of his life. His activities arising from this, whatever direction these may take—whether in the sphere of organisation, or in that of purely physical labour, etc.—must be always shot through with this fire, must be undertaken in concord with the collective as a whole. A man must think in terms of “we”, must become a living, useful and relevant organ, part of that “we”. All personal interests must be put away far into the background. But this does not mean that we want to destroy natural human cares, cares for the satisfaction of *one's own* needs, the personal instinct. We say only that this must give way before the demands of collective life.

At the same time we are far from wishing to turn men into a herd, to submerge individuality, to expunge originality. Not in the least! Our requirement is that on a collective foundation a man's personal characteristics should have full development. This is the guarantee of far-reaching division of labour within society. Only a society which is full of variety in its constituent separate human personalities, which consists of clearly expressed individualities, is a truly cultured, rich society. A herd-bound personality easily gives way to Bonapartism, to leader-worship of all kinds. A herd-bound man cannot have a critical attitude to all that life faces him with. We must give full scope to the individual characteristics, the talents, the purposeful skills, that a man has chosen for himself and that society has marked out for him. What then must we do? Educate a man truly appropriate to our great epoch of transition.

On Physical Education

Dialectical materialism, by which we are guided, obliges us to build our educational practice on the basis of precise

educational knowledge. From those who study child development we must obtain absolutely clear indications on the nature of the infant organism, its development, the natural tendencies of that development. We need a precise knowledge of the child as an organism, from the point of view of anatomy, physiology and social biology, then it will be clear what mental raw material an eight-year-old comes into school with, and from what source that material is drawn. All this is the task of child development studies, both biological and social.

It is quite clear that in dealing with the child as an organism, the aspect of its anatomical and physiological development must be well to the fore. The physical formation of the child is the basis for all the rest. Without proper health care during the child's development, without properly organised physical culture and sport, we shall never obtain a healthy generation. In leaving these matters to "life itself", which is in a state of dreadful disarray, in paying little heed to health care during the years of childhood, we are committing a great crime.

We need to realise all the importance of these matters. One cannot even begin to think of correct sexual development for a child if it is brought up without fresh air and lives in dirt, and is thus an organism that has been blocked in its development and given an unhealthy direction. One cannot think of bringing up a generation of good working abilities, if those belonging to it are going to have flabby muscles, underdeveloped bones and bad hearts. Meanwhile, if we take a look now at this side of things, we shall see a horrifying situation. I cannot say that we have paid sufficient attention to this, that its importance has really come home to us. In the actual school timetable, what is called physical culture occupies a quite insignificant place. We have as yet done practically nothing towards training teachers of physical culture, towards ensuring a sufficient number of thorough masters of their craft in this field. Yet without corrective gymnastics, without ordinary gymnastics that correctly develop the pupil's body, and without a considerable inclusion of sports—of the kind we have defined as appropriately Soviet—we shall undoubtedly falsify the total picture of the school, and we shall get negative results.

Along with physical culture we must not forget the importance of "combat" sports, bearing in mind their current forms, which make a man into a real fighter, collected and capable of concentrated and effective effort in action, of showing ingenuity and energy in contest. In foreign countries all this is given an individualistic slant; there the object of the exercise is that a man should be able to use his teeth and claws to make his own way, his own career. In our, Soviet, sport we start from quite different principles and shall get, naturally, different results. We also have military service, military training, but their character is quite different from that they bear abroad: there they serve oppression, here—the fight for freedom. Our gun is a sinful weapon like any other, and under socialism we shall do away with it, but at the present time it has a *different social significance*.

On Labour Education

The next question is one of exceptional importance—that of labour in school, and the educational significance of this. In the labour school we have always approached this matter in two ways.

We have considered that the actual process of instruction should be carried out by labour methods, i.e. we have held that it should not be a one-sided activity, the pupil only acquiring knowledge from books or from the teacher's words. There must be some active part taken by the child in this process of assimilating knowledge, some part which brings more or less all of his organism into play in the course of an interesting process where he has to overcome certain difficulties both theoretical and physical, meanwhile gaining knowledge and practising it within himself. Thanks to the system of work in school which is becoming established here, instruction itself includes the element of labour, i.e. it is achieved in joint work, by collecting material, through independent collation of facts of all kinds, collective consideration of reports, all sorts of discussions, etc.

Any process of instruction should be accompanied by satisfaction, by enjoyment, but to draw the conclusion that

school work ought to be made something in the nature of voluntary activity—this would be a false conclusion on the whole, except possibly as regards those forms of instruction employed for very young children. It is essential to train the child to overcome obstacles, even at the cost of some weariness. In life one often has to weary oneself in order to achieve any sort of effectiveness in one's work. We must teach the child to use his powers to the best effect, i.e. teach him not just to toil, but to find within himself the resources to motivate himself to work; bring him to the idea that working can itself yield an enjoyment of a new order, the pleasure of the goal achieved. We must teach him how to approach work in a sensible, organised manner, to overcome difficulties, and to collectivise work.

Practice in setting goals, in the skill of rationally expending the energy in a given direction—this is of immense importance as exemplifying the method to be followed in acquiring any kind of knowledge. In the old-style school they often used to say that school existed not so much for transmitting knowledge as for giving pupils certain formal skills. This was the argument used to justify the study of the dead languages: they (the languages) brought to the forefront the method to be followed in mastering the formal aspects of the material—a richer and more varied method than that offered by formal logic, inasmuch as here one has a vast store of exceptions and paradoxes.

Those who considered this matter rather more deeply declared that these studies were important because they trained a man to perform any task that was set him without worrying about its essential nature. Precisely this point was included in a petition that was presented to Wilhelm II, in which it was said that he would then have very good subjects, very good officials, who would be like efficient milling machines that would grind anything from coffee to gravel; they would be men who could carry out orders with extraordinary precision, and everything on the formal side would be absolutely exact.⁷

All legal education and also one form of training we have never had, known as the "cameral" school,⁸ was of this sort. With the bureaucratic executive skills acquired therein people went on for the rest of their lives; they only drew up papers—and became quite outstanding officials

or bureaucrats. At one time they tried to do the same sort of thing with us, enclosing us in high-school uniforms and subjecting us to barrack-room discipline. We felt the heavy hand of external discipline and formal application of our abilities, to order from above, following ideas alien to us.

We need something different. In our educational system we provide profoundly real content, not the formal aspect of the matter, not just mastery of the forms of rational mental work, but rational physical work, which is now, in its highest forms, work with machines, work in the industrial establishment. We have always taken the view (and this has distinguished us from the leading American schools) that the labour school must give the child and teenager polytechnical knowledge, i.e. a grasp, acquired from several examples, of the basic principles, the basic processes of contemporary, highly sophisticated, scientifically organised labour. So far we have failed to achieve this in the mass schools, but this does not mean that the idea is incorrect; the failure is to be explained by the under-development of our industry, the low level of our agriculture; given these, it is not possible for our schools to reach the safe shores of properly, industrially organised labour.

There was only one way out—to organise good workshops, within the school or centrally for several schools. At rural schools to establish orchards, vegetable gardens, simple forms of keeping livestock, things that would make a certain level of achievement possible, on the scale of an enlarged and improved farm economy. We have not succeeded in doing this to the extent required. But in many well-run schools one can find some labour processes well exemplified. The leading examples here are the Factory Apprentice Schools and the Industrial Seven-Year Schools. They give us what as yet we cannot have in the mass of urban and rural schools.

The importance of labour in education is enormous. It hardly needs saying that the whole of what is designated as "mental work" is a poor substitute in respect of producing what we think of as a whole man. The continual tendency of our intellectuals, even on the technical side, to deviate into idealism, in forms such as Machism,⁹ is due to a large extent to the fact that these people do not

have contact with material things. True, they hold pen or pencil in their hands when they write, sit on chairs at the table in their homes, but basically they only *look on*—or, at best, *observe* in the laboratory. They do not come to grips with nature at close quarters, they do not conquer it by physical strength, and for this reason they do not sense its living, dynamic reality. Here we have the roots of the idea that the world consists of our sensations—solipsism,¹⁰ etc.—something that can in no way be brought into line with either socialist struggle or socialist practice.

We need man the materialist, and you will learn a lot more materialism standing at a lathe than you will through reading the works of a materialist philosopher, because in the second case you have only ideas, constructions, words, but will not find the experience that makes a member of the proletariat a true materialist—such a materialist that even if he happens, through cultural backwardness, to be religious, all that drops away from him in the twinkling of an eye as soon as he comes into contact with his working comrades who have a more correct view of things. The whole point here is not only acquisition of craft skills, not only better control of our muscles—the point is becoming acquainted with the available tools. And these available tools are now of vast importance.

Marx and Engels considered that the available tools, all our array of machines, had subjected human society to themselves, and that the task of socialism was to ensure that these means of production which compelled humanity to split up into classes, which put power into the hands of the bourgeoisie, should be conquered and submitted to man.

Of course we still have a great deal of the old Oblomov* left here. We still need to tear this trend out by the roots, to re-order our rhythms, our tempo. Only urbanisation, only the machine can give us the new tempo, can reconstruct man. The rural tempo, the hard, slow labour of the countryside, the country habit of a long, pointless abandonment of work in the winter months, all create an exceptionally slow flow

*The main character of a 19th-century novel by Goncharov, a serf-owning landlord so lazy he could not even get dressed without outside help.—*Tr.*

of life, and this has left its imprint even on the town, and on each one of us. In all of us there is a little of the yokel sitting on a cart with one leg dangling, while the draught ox progresses a mile in goodness knows how long. And from these vast distances of our far-flung steppes, from this hibernation in winter, we have to change gear into the tempo of Mr. Ford, when a man has no time to sit down, when the machine will have his finger off if he slackens his attention a minute.

Factory production drives out any residue of the peasant tempo from our worker. The amount of labour demanded of him has to be given with uncommon concentration. Labour of this kind will enable us to beat the Western European and to re-educate ourselves in the industrial spirit, will give us the possibility of creating a man who in tempo and precision will be of a new kind, a kind that cannot be created without the help of the machine.

One might indicate many other aspects of the influence of labour on education, but I shall stop here.

On the Connection Between Instruction and Education

Education as a whole is made up of instruction and moral education, and the two are intertwined. For instruction we take the old culture, i.e. all that has been created by the human race up to now; we also take that which bourgeois culture has rejected—Marxism and all that flows from it, which is the beginning of the new world. Marxism follows on from the whole development of science, but was rejected by the bourgeoisie as being contrary to its interests. In Marxism human thought outgrew the framework of the bourgeois world just as industry has outgrown it. In this contradiction lies, in Engels' conception, the germ of the socialist movement and the guarantee of its success.¹¹

In the field of the natural sciences Marxism prints itself deep. It re-works natural science, frees it from those adulterations which bourgeois thought has brought, and continues to bring into it. Bourgeois thought senses quite clearly, and in some cases understands quite accurately, that correctly presented natural science, with all its con-

stituent branches, leads inevitably to Marxism. That is why bourgeois thinking attacks Darwinism, attacks technical biology, for it thinks that otherwise it cannot save its own order of things. In particular, it falsifies the premises of natural science, going deep down to the very roots of man's view of the world and there injecting its poisons. The bourgeoisie fears that within natural science the flower of Marxism and Communism may come to bloom.

We must teach natural science in such a way that there is no room for any mysticism whatever in it, not even of the most refined sort, so that it represents consistent materialism.

The content of the natural sciences opens up a whole complex of educational work, such as: giving the scientific content of Marxism in a form accessible to children, offering as it were a children's edition of the foundations of Marxism; giving children a certain concept of man within nature, of the historical development of human society, of the injustice that reigns in human society, of the meaning of the proletarian revolution, of the meaning of the October Revolution, of the situation created in this country in relation to other powers, of the tasks that flow from our revolution, and so on—i.e. roughly that whole complex of problems which we have to teach cyclically, starting with simpler forms and gradually passing on to more complete ones, following the methods now recommended.

The content of social science also represents a great educational force.

It remains beyond dispute, however, that one can know a very great deal and not be changed by that knowledge in the least. The task of moral education is to create a mood, or in Pavlovian¹² terms to create a certain system of constant and conditioned reflexes, which will ensure that the human being will function in life in a given way. We have no physical means of doing this, but we know how powerfully a human being's reflexes are changed when acted upon by what is known as emotion. When a human being is moved, when he feels joy, or sadness, or contempt, when he laughs aloud—this means profound processes are at work within the nervous system. These processes may be only superficial, but they can also be extremely profound. When people say, "It made an unforgettable im-

pression on me", "It left its mark on the whole of my life", and so on, this denotes moments of deep emotion which indeed re-order the nervous system, in these or those of its parts, creating new reflexes, inducing new reactions to these or those phenomena—the human being is re-born, assumes a new image.

Without stirring up or stimulating the nervous system one cannot carry out agitation of even the simplest kind—collect a crowd together, for instance, and get them to put a fire out. Still less is it possible to produce an educational effect. By the emotional colouration given to the teaching material, by evoking emotional reactions, and through the emotions evoking changes in the consciousness of the pupils, one can give a morally educational charge to any process of perception of this or that external action.

The social science can be taught calmly, without the teacher being moved or moving anyone else. Such a science will be a bore, it will flow away like water through a funnel—however much you pour in, it all runs out the other end. Yet there is no more lively, more emotional subject than the social science. It is compact of pictures, of the struggle of man with nature, of people against one another, of the conflict between our great aims today and the darkness that has to be conquered. The smallest child can be told the history of culture like a glorious fairy story, and there is no better story, no one could invent it! What is needed is, firstly, that the material should be brought together in a lively manner, in such a way that it (the class struggle, for instance) is something creative, not just bare facts, not just a sequence, but a dynamic process. One needs a certain ability to present material. Not theatrical effects, of course, but intimacy of tone, simplicity of language, sincerity and feeling on the part of the teacher. Various resources can be brought in to assist: well-thought-out excursions, illustration by means of works of art (literary and pictorial), and actual introduction to this or that aspect of real life.

We can study the past and bring it to life again through excursions to museums, the study of collections, while the present one can treat by getting into life itself, gaining a closer acquaintance with it. This brings us to the question of artistic education.

There are ideas current that the aim of artistic education is to train artists, to discover those with special talents, or to develop in every child this or that degree of artistic ability. Aestheticism as a goal must be rejected. If we attain something in this respect along the way, well and good. Professional art education should take place in art schools.

But there is another idea, which puts forward the following viewpoint: artistic education has the aim of training children from their earliest years to appreciate works of art properly, to appreciate the creative work of the artist, art itself, and the life of nature; that it has the aim of teaching aesthetic enjoyment both of those products of human talent intended to evoke such enjoyment, and of nature, and of those phenomena in human life which are marked by light and grace. This is good, but even this is not the main point for our days. This too is something by the way.

The basic intent of artistic education must be to find such means of acting upon the feelings of children as will most powerfully and lastingly educate them in the spirit of communist instincts, communist traits, communist reflexes. The basic role of art is the re-education of man. Insofar as literature, painting, music will contribute to the re-education of man, to that extent they are useful in their ideological aspect. The social science must be lively, agitational, stimulating and thereby educational. Art must be brought into this. One cannot do without it, for literature gives the world of the old and of the new. What distinguishes a writer from a publicist is that the former excites us, that the images he creates can lay hold on us, shake us. So we must bring literature into play, of course literature of a kind suitable to the age-group we are dealing with. In just the same way the teacher must be able to draw out from the pictures in any gallery, whether it is the Tretyakov¹³ or any provincial museum, elements which educate the child's emotions. This is the aim of children's theatre also, and of taking children to the theatre.

The same aim should be pursued in children's independent creative work in art. Children's creative work should be a collective activity. Taking part in festivals, in organising festivals—this is participation in social life, but of a

totally organised kind. A festival is an artistic organisation of social life, in which everything is concentrated, everything is compressed, everything has taken on an effective, exciting form. In order to experience this people come together, they create the festival together, they enjoy it together. A school festival, held within the school, is a part of a wider life. Through the festival life comes into the school, finds an echo in the school.

On these lines other types of children's artistic work also proceed. Making up albums, drawings or paintings that reflect these or those events, this or that side of life; holding an exhibition of different pieces of work that reflect in artistic form, from various sides, the life outside school; producing a theatrical show devoted to some particular event and setting the children the task of creating a play, a ceremonial or display for other children, for parents, for those around them—all these devices touch on the social science on the one hand, and on actual participation in the life of society on the other, on the children's response to current politics, and they remain long in the memory. Even in the old school, unsuitable for us, it was school plays that left more trace, and a brighter trace, than whole years of teaching, because in such plays the human being is an operative, creative, active agent. All these forms of artistic education must occupy a significant place in our schools.

Artistic education must be accepted as one of the methods of social education, and brought up to a proper level. We need to review once again our general principles, and bring all our education closer, than has been the case up to now, to socio-political education, and correlate everything in this sphere with this central crank-shaft. Then we shall be able to raise the purely aesthetic side of education too, for we shall be giving it a definite content, filling it with what is politically valuable.

Every festival organised in school becomes part of general social life, and has immense educational significance. The same significance attaches to methods of educationally organised intervention in the life of society, in the form of socially useful labour. Direct participation by children in labour—itself an organising force—that improves sanitary conditions, or the daily environment, or that

helps to combat ignorance—all this is taking shape, is already being done.

It is essential to organise children to react very flexibly to events in society. It is important not only that children in a given small town should take part in looking after the upkeep of a park or garden, or undertake to teach a certain number of illiterate children or adults—it is important that they should respond to events in China, too, and to political slogans put out by the Party. One must be able to take the newspaper that we have for our information every day, and to translate it, if one can put it like that, into language that children can understand. Something of the kind is already done, in the Pioneer newspapers. Passing on to children the information contained in the popular press should be a constant function of the school. One must see that the emotions are engaged in the process. Children must mark great events by meetings, festivals etc. Children must mark events using the same forms by which adults react to those events.

On Combatting Reactionary Influences on the Schools

Public attention today focusses closely on the schools. Special schools sections have been created by local Soviets. Attention is paid to the schools not only by those deputed to do so; local Soviets, trade unions, and other social bodies are paying attention too. The working population in a school's area takes part in the life of the school. The Young Communist League stimulates the school. The Commissariat for Education can state with pride that it always pays the closest heed to the voice of the Young Communist League.

At present public attention is concerned about the schools: is reaction not lurking there? is there not deliberate sabotage? is there not extreme resistance to change, and inability to change, among old teachers? or are there not very unskilled new teachers, who want to do the right thing but are unable? or are there not Communists who are not measuring up to their responsibilities? Public opinion puts us under a certain critical review, and asks the teach-

er: are you devoting all your powers to your work, and are they as rationally directed as they should be? If a man has applied all his powers, and done so in a rational manner, then no blame can be attached to him.

But this is not all there is to it.

We have teachers with good, honourable, philanthropic hearts, with settled, skilful methods in their specialist work among a given body of children. In school work such a teacher does his job conscientiously. He says, "I am giving you all my powers; I think I am doing a useful job: I teach children to read and write, I develop their aesthetic capabilities, I talk to them about what is good and what is evil, I do not tell them that one should say one's prayers, I do not teach them the fear of God, although I do not assure anyone, either, that that would be wrong. Politically I have no quarrel with you, if only because I have no political views. And if I am not doing enough in the way of political education, then tell me what I am to do. I am prepared to work to your directives, so long as you do not offend my opinions as a teacher. But if you say that I must foster class hatred in children, that I must tell them that the bourgeoisie should be extirpated in every way—then I am sorry, but I have not a hard and horny heart, and to give children hard and horny hearts is wrong. I can tell children only that one should love all men, that socialism is the reign of love and peace and so they should love socialism. Within these limits I am in agreement with you."

Such a teacher must be adjudged unsuitable *for the given period*, the present, when we have to attack with greater energy, take more energetic steps to win over the children. Our work is often complicated by political factors of all sorts: here or there our enemies are stirring, they are stirring even in the schools, and we have to fight those enemies. And to those who cannot fight we have to say "For times of peace you will pass as a teacher, but at the present time you cannot be allowed near children."

But such a line may also become extremely dangerous: if we set our demands as high as the full one hundred per cent, we may leave our front quite bare of defenders. These teachers of varying shades of opinion—they are often experienced, excellent practical workers, good masters

of teaching method and good educators, but their work needs correcting factors to right the balance. Communist public opinion has attained some maturity now. We must use our skill to join one thing to the other.

The schools experience other influences too; the deep-rooted, stagnant environment of the petty bourgeoisie sends its children too into our schools. These children bring into school with them all manner of forms of antisemitism, religious attitudes, all sorts of political gossip, all kind of dirty insinuations. Among them we can observe self-seeking, careerist motivations of all sorts, especially in the senior forms. We see organisations of every conceivable kind arising, in which they group together. Of course young men at a certain period of their lives have a great tendency to secretiveness, a yen for "closed" organisations, for plotting together, playing at conspiracies, playing at being important. Organisations of this kind, according to American educationists, inevitably appear among children 14-15 years old. They mark the awakening of social instincts, of their own peculiar kind, which we must satisfy by filling them with a content that belongs to our order of society. Such organisations disintegrate and arise afresh; sometimes it turns out that they are entirely erotic cum pornographic in nature, sometimes they may be counter-revolutionary as well. The influence of the philistine home background makes itself felt, with all its malice, all its petty-bourgeois way of life.

If we do not make our own way into that world, into the family, it will smother us. But we can exert influence on it through the children themselves (particularly in the rural schools), and we must influence it by taking care to maintain communication with parents. It is a very big and a very complex task, but I see no other way forward, no other means of hastening the process of making people other than they once were.

We are creating an experimental field, in which we can learn methods of educating, using chosen material and the help of teachers of another order. This is the Pioneer movement. We are convinced that the children who are predisposed to communism and who are eager to join the Pioneer movement will give us the opportunity to make them the nucleus, the germ that will act upon other people

near to them, and on the environment surrounding the school.

The question arises, what should be mutual relationship of the world of school and the world of the Pioneers? What is needed is that teacher and Pioneer leader should have complete trust in one another; we must establish a method of *attentive cooperation, and in this contact with the young people of the Young Communist League it is the teacher who must learn*. The Young Communist League is not an atmosphere existing in isolation, its heat is felt by others, and often burns away all manner of impurities. From the ranks of the League's members will come, too, the teachers who will carry on our work.

SUPPLEMENT

A. V. Lunacharsky: A Brief Biographical Note

Anatoli Vasilievich Lunacharsky was born on 11 November, 1875, into the family of a liberally inclined civil servant. While still a pupil at the Kiev Gymnazia (High School) Lunacharsky entered the revolutionary movement and carried on propaganda work at mills and factories, in workers' circles (study groups). In 1895 he joined the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Russia (RSDLP), linking his life thenceforward with the party of the Russian proletariat, with the struggle for socialism, with the cause for which V. I. Lenin fought.

By reason of his political "unreliability" Lunacharsky was not admitted to Moscow University. He was obliged to continue his education abroad, in Switzerland, at the University of Zurich, where in 1895-97 he studied philosophy and natural science. In 1897 Lunacharsky returned to Russia. Having been elected a member of the Moscow Committee of the RSDLP, he took up active revolutionary work. In 1899 this work was interrupted by arrest, imprisonment, and later exile. But while in exile Lunacharsky did not give up his revolutionary and propaganda work, his collaboration on the production of revolutionary publications.

At the invitation of V. I. Lenin, who followed the young revolutionary's propaganda and publicist work with close attention, Lunacharsky in 1904 left Russia and joined the editorial staff of the Bolshevik papers *Vperyod* (Forward) and *Proletary* (The Proletarian), which were published in Geneva, and from this period dates the fruitful collaboration of Lunacharsky and Lenin, who had a high opinion of Lunacharsky and called him "a man of uncommon natural gifts" (M. Gorky, "V. I. Lenin", *Collected Works* in 30 volumes, Vol. 17, p. 21). In April 1905, V. I. Lenin commissioned Lunacharsky to make an opening report at the Third Congress of the RSDLP, on one of the most important questions to be discussed—that of armed uprising.

The development of revolutionary events in Russia, which in 1905 brought about the start of the first Russian Revolution, made it possible for Lunacharsky to return to his native country. He organised revolutionary work in St. Petersburg, takes an active part in the publication of the Bolshevik newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* (New Life), in which he appears as a brilliant protagonist of Lenin's ideas, a passionate fighter for the revolutionary transformation of society. Before long Lunacharsky was again arrested, but he succeeded in escaping, and once again went abroad. He took part, as a representative of the Bolsheviks, in the Stuttgart (1907) and Copenhagen (1910) Congresses of the Second International.

The defeat of the first Russian Revolution of 1905-07 led Lunacharsky to some mistaken theoretical conclusions. Later, Lunacharsky wrote that Lenin's harsh and uncompromising criticism helped him to realise the incorrectness of his own stand and the unassailable rightness of V. I. Lenin, who was able, during the grim years of reaction that set in after the defeat of the first Russian Revolution, to foresee the line of further development of revolutionary events, and to draw the Party more firmly together and direct it to the preparation of new class battles.

In April 1917, after the February Revolution that toppled tsarism, Lunacharsky returned to Russia and under V. I. Lenin's guidance took up revolutionary activities in Petrograd; one aspect of those activities was bringing the intelligentsia over to the side of the Revolution.

Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Petrograd, there was created the first Soviet Government, headed by V. I. Lenin. At Lenin's suggestion, Lunacharsky became a member of that government. He headed the People's Commissariat for Education, and continued in that post for twelve years. In September 1929 Lunacharsky was appointed Chairman of the Academic Committee attached to the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, and in 1933 he was appointed Envoy Plenipotentiary of the USSR to Spain. On the way to Spain he was taken seriously ill, and on 26 December he died, at Menton in the south of France. Lunacharsky lies buried in Moscow, by the Kremlin wall in Red Square.

A man of encyclopaedic knowledge, with eleven languages at his command, a talented scholar, an eminent theoretician in the fields of art and literature, a critic of originality, a writer and playwright, a publicist and an orator—Lunacharsky made an immense contribution to the creation of a socialist culture. His name is inextricably bound up with an entire period in the development of a socialist culture, of a socialist intelligentsia, of Soviet literature and art, of Marxist aesthetics and art criticism, of educational theory and of the actual education of the people.

Lunacharsky played a most important part in propaganda for socialist culture outside the country. The foreign press used to call him the most cultured and well-educated Minister of Education in any European country. He was a personal friend of Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, Bernard Shaw, Berthold Brecht, who all had a high opinion of the Soviet People's Commissar with his great gifts. In Romain Rolland's words, Anatoli Lunacharsky was "a universally respected ambassador of Soviet thought and art outside his country".

Lunacharsky's pen was responsible for an enormous number of works: on matters of literature, music, theatre, painting, architecture, ethics, aesthetics, the history of philosophic and revolutionary thought, international politics, anti-religious propaganda, educational theory, educational practice, etc. Lunacharsky also made his own contribution to imaginative writing—he was the author of many plays: *Barber to the King* (1906), *Faust and the City* (1918), *Oliver Cromwell* (1930), *Thomas Campanella* (1922), *Don Quixote Liberated* (1922), *Poison* (1926), etc.

In this great and variegated legacy left by Lunacharsky, an important place belongs to his works on matters of education, both formal and moral. There are over three hundred such works. They reflect practically every aspect of the formation of the Soviet educational system, all the tasks which the Revolution set before educational theory and practice. Many of these works are of more than theoretical interest. A considerable proportion of them retain their relevance even today, and help us think through afresh and make decisions on a number of complex questions in the theory and practice of education.

As the first People's Commissar for Education, Lunacharsky stood at the first springhead of the Soviet school. At Lenin's call he took the lead in creating a new, socialist system of education. He was to bring about the first realisation in practice of Marxist ideals of education and culture. And this had to be done under the unbelievably tangled conditions of the first years following the October Revolution. "To give to the people as quickly as possible the greatest possible sum of knowledge, in preparation for the giant's role that the Revolution has laid upon that people,"—in these words Lunacharsky summed up the aim and sense of his work as People's Commissar for Education.

The range and scale of that work was uncommonly wide. It took in every facet of culture and education—from doing away with illiteracy to the political education of the masses, from teaching establishments of all levels to the sciences, art, literature, and so on. And all this multifarious activity bore the clear imprint of the personality of Lunacharsky, that most highly cultured man and most passionate fighter for Communist ideas.

Notes

The Notes provided to the works here published are of two kinds: the first being for the elucidation of historical and educational aspects of the material, and the second being on what may be called matters of fact.

The object of the historical and educational Notes is to outline the historical setting of the period when the given work was written, to indicate their *raison d'être*, the actual circumstances which called forth those works, and lastly to elucidate the basic ideas contained in them, and their significance in the history of Soviet educational thought, their role and place within the general sum of questions being dealt with today by the Soviet school and by educational science. Each historical-educational note is prefaced by a brief bibliographical note on the date of appearance of the given work.

The object of the factual Notes is rather narrower—to acquaint the reader with facts, events, and circumstances mentioned by Lunacharsky, with the educationists, scholars and public figures whose ideas he may in these works be supporting or attacking.

It would seem useful to make a short comment here on the peculiarities of terminology used by Lunacharsky.

In the works here published, a number of terms used by Lunacharsky are employed in a manner somewhat different from the interpretation they bear in contemporary Soviet writing on education. This applies particularly to the concept of "education" itself, which Lunacharsky defined as the "formation of", or "giving an image to", the child. (Cf. the articles "What is Education", "The Tasks of Extra-Mural Education in Soviet Russia", "Education of the New Man", "The Educational Tasks of the Soviet School".) Education, in Lunacharsky's concept, is "made up of instruction and moral education, the two being intertwined".

Such an interpretation of the word *obrazovaniye* is not the one which has come to be accepted in Soviet educational usage. The contemporary term which approaches this concept most nearly is "education in the widest sense", i.e. education as the totality of influences defining the process of character formation, including formal "education" and instruction. These terminological variations, however, in no way diminish the force of Lunacharsky's basic concept, which has become one of the foundations of Soviet educational thought—the idea of the unity and interconnection of "moral education" (in its narrow sense) and instruction, as the most important factors in the formation of personality. Equally great is the importance that still attaches to Lunacharsky's idea that "education is not a matter of schools alone", that the schools give only the key to true "education".

Speech at the First All-Russia Congress on Education

Speech delivered on 26 August, 1918

In the first years following the Great October Socialist Revolution, congresses on people's education played an important part in determining the lines of development of the new, socialist school, and in forming the ideological and theoretical foundations of Soviet educational practice. Of particular importance was the part these congresses played in drawing the general body of teachers over to the side of the Soviet government, in mobilising all the forces available within society to solve the problems of radically reconstructing the schools. In 1918, in the Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic 164 local congresses of teachers were held, and 81 congresses of workers in education.

The conclusions from all this multifarious activities in working out the principles of socialist organisation of education for the people were summed up by the First All-Russia Congress on Education, in which over 700 people took part. The Congress took place from 25th August to 4th September, 1918, in Moscow. V. I. Lenin spoke at it. His speech outlines the importance of education for the masses, and first and foremost the importance of the schools, in build-

ing a new, socialist society. (For text of Lenin's speech see *Complete Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 85-86.)

The Congress discussed the Draft Theses on the Unified Labour School, which was approved by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee (VTsIK). Simultaneously with the Theses were published the Basic Principles of the Unified Labour School, also approved by the Congress. (This document is also known as the Declaration on the Unified Labour School.) Both documents played a most important part in the history of the Soviet school. They crowned the ideological, theoretical and organisational preparation of the radical transformations in the schools of Russia that were to take place, and ushered in a new stage—that of the practical realisation of those transformations.

Underlining the great significance of the Theses and the Declaration, the Congress noted in its resolutions: "In ardent sympathy with the transforming activities of the Commissariat for People's Education, and pledging to the latter our most active support in the localities, the delegates to the First All-Russia Congress on Education are fully aware that the success of this work can be envisaged only on condition of final and complete triumph by the principles of the social revolution.... Let none of us be dismayed by the fact that we must accomplish this great task in the grievous setting of famine, poverty, social disintegration and absence of all the essential material conditions for the development of the schools. We have as yet no properly trained reserves of personnel for teaching, no books, no teaching aids, no school buildings, but what we have with us, and not against us, is the good genius of the socialist revolution, and, given that we sufficiently put forth our strength, and with the help of that same 'labour method' which we are about to bring into daily use in our schools, we shall, following the example of all pioneers who have built a new life where nothing was before, in the end build a majestic edifice, over the doors of which shall stand the words 'The Unified Socialist Labour School'." (Resolution of the First All-Russia Congress on Education, Moscow, 1918, pp. 1-2.)

In speaking at the Congress, Anatoli Lunacharsky summed up the activities of the People's Commissariat for Education over the ten months that had passed since October 1917; he stressed that their working-out of the "socialist foundations for the education of the new generation, and the re-creation, in the new 'labour' spirit, of all the teaching and scientific bodies in the country" had been proceeding under conditions of extreme confusion. Only after comparative normalisation of the situation on the internal and external fronts had been achieved, after sabotage on the part of some teachers had been overcome, and an organisational apparatus for the People's Commissariat for Education created—only then was it possible "to start thinking of serious ideological struggle with the old system of education". The main idea, the

burden of Lunacharsky's speech is struggle for the new, labour school, for education for all the people.

1. The idea referred to belongs to Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States of America (1801-09). Lunacharsky had written about this in a brief note "From the Editors" which appeared, not long before the Congress, in the journal *Vestnik narodnogo prosveshcheniya Soyuza Kommun Severnoi Oblasti* (Education Courier of the Northern Regional Union of Communes), 1919, No. 1, August, p. 21: "Thomas Jefferson ... in 1786, i.e. three years before the start of the French Revolution, wrote to his great predecessor as follows—'I hold it to be axiomatic that our freedom can be safe only in the hands of the people themselves, and then only if the people have attained a certain level of education. That is why the introduction of education on a common plan is the first charge of the state.'"

2. The victory of the revolutionary uprising of workers and soldiers on 27 February, 1917 was the opening event in the bourgeois-democratic February Revolution in Russia. Tsarism was overthrown. In the early days of March 1917 the bourgeois-democratic revolution had triumphed in most of the country's cities and towns. The February Revolution was a most important stage on the way towards the Great October Socialist Revolution.

As a result of the February Revolution a situation emerged in which there were two centres of authority—the Provisional Government and the Soviets (or Councils) of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. The main aim of the Provisional Government in March/April 1917 was, in Lenin's words, "thwarting the revolution, as cautiously and quietly as possible, and promising everything without fulfilling any of its promises". (V. I. Lenin, "Lessons of the Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 235.) Having overthrown tsarism, the February Revolution failed to solve the problems that then faced it. The Bolshevik Party under Lenin's leadership then developed action aimed at escalating the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

3. The first Soviet Constitution was the Constitution of the Russian Federation approved by the Fifth All-Russia Congress of Soviets in 1918. The Constitution was the legislative affirmation of Soviet power as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, also confirming the abolition of capitalist and land-owning property, equality of rights of all nationalities within Russia, etc. The Constitution gave all working people in Russia the opportunity to participate in running the state, and deprived exploiters of voting rights.

In 1924, The Second Congress of Soviets of the USSR approved the first Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In November 1936, a new Constitution of the USSR was approved by the Eighth (Extraordinary) All-Union Congress of Soviets. This Constitution gave legal recognition of the profound changes that had taken place since the time of the 1924 Constitution, and reflected the fact that socialism had triumphed within the USSR.

The Constitution of the USSR now in force—the Constitution of a developed socialist society—was approved by a Special Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 7 October, 1977. It stresses that “developed socialist society is a natural, logical stage on the road to communism”, that “the Soviet state has become a state of the whole people”. [*Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, pp. 13-14]. The new Constitution, as was noted in a speech to the Special Session of the Supreme Soviet by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Chairman of the Constitutional Commission, “epitomises the whole sixty years’ development of the Soviet state. It is striking evidence of the fact that the ideas proclaimed by the October Revolution and Lenin’s precepts are being successfully put into practice”. [L. I. Brezhnev, *On the Draft Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Unions of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Results of the Nationwide Discussion of the Draft*, Moscow, 1977, p. 7.]

4. The State Committee on Education was set up after the February Revolution as an advisory body to the Ministry of Education of the Provisional Government. After the October Revolution, Lunacharsky in his first declaration addressed to the public (“On Education for the People”, 29 October, 1917) put the offer of co-operation with the Soviet authorities to this Committee. The Committee rejected the offer and demonstratively ceased work. It was dissolved by a decree of the Council of People’s Commissars in November 1917.

On 9 November, 1917 a decree of the Central Executive Committee set up the State Commission on People’s Education, whose function was to be “general guidance of education”. A decree of the Council of People’s Commissars in June 1918, “On the Organisation of the People’s Education in the Soviet Federated Socialist Republic of Russia”, laid down that the members of the State Commission were to include leading workers from the Commissariat for Education, representatives of central Soviet, trade union and cooperative bodies, and representatives of regional education offices. The Commission was to work under the leadership of the People’s Commissar for Education.

5. In his address to the teaching profession of 15 November, 1917, Lunacharsky wrote “...For decades the best portion of the Russian intelligentsia has served the people, and has been proud of that service. It has held the cause of education, of arousing the consciousness of the masses of the people, to be of especial importance.... The teacher, the true teacher... must above all be with the people in all it lives through, even when it wanders lost. Go and help the people. It is full of strength, but surrounded by disaster. Glory to those who in the dire hour of trial by fire are found with the people, whatever the state in which it finds itself. Dishonour to those who abandon the people.... The people calls on you to work together with it—it will do its work, supported only by its faithful fellow-workers and voluntary helpers. There is no

return to what used to be." [*Anatoli Lunacharsky o narodnom obrazovanii* (on Education), Moscow, 1958, pp. 515-518, (in Russian).]

6. The All-Russia Teachers' Union (Russian initials VUS) was founded in June 1905. In 1909 it broke up. In 1917, after the February Revolution, it was re-established, and branches of it came into existence in practically all places.

In both the first and the second period of its activities the All-Russia Teachers' Union was politically under the influence of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. It took up a hostile attitude to the October Revolution of 1917. In December 1917 the Council of the Teachers' Union attempted to organise a strike of teachers, but its call was not successful.

By the autumn of 1918 the counter-revolutionary leadership of the Union had lost its influence, and many of its local branches had entered into close cooperation with the Soviet government. By a decision of the All-Russia Executive Committee, of 23 December, 1918, the All-Russia Teachers' Union was disbanded.

7. In his article "How We Occupied the Ministry of Education" (1927) Lunacharsky wrote: "To reconcile Soviet power and the officials of the Ministry of Education proved impossible." The officials decided on sabotage, and openly declared that "they would never give in". Lunacharsky recalled how, the first time that he and others came to the Ministry, "we made our way through rooms that were completely empty". The representatives of the People's Commissariat for Education were met only by a few people from among the clerical staff. [*Anatoli Lunacharsky o narodnom obrazovanii* (on Education), pp. 366-67.]

8. When the Soviet Government moved from Petrograd to Moscow in March 1918, Lunacharsky addressed to the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Federation a memorandum in which he stated: "I take it upon myself to propose to my comrade Commissars that I personally should be its official representative in Petrograd.... I am conscious of the responsibility I am taking upon myself, of how burdensome, dangerous and even, one may say, disastrous is the position which I ask permission to take up, but unless I am mistaken, it is my duty to do this." [*V. I. Lenin and Lunacharsky*, in *Literary Heritage*, Vol. 80, Moscow, 1971, pp. 58-59, (in Russian).]

Lunacharsky remained in Petrograd until the beginning of 1919; he visited Moscow at intervals, discharging the duties of both People's Commissar for Education of the Russian Federation and People's Commissar for Education of the Union of Communes, Northern Region. In May 1919, the Union of Communes of the Northern Region was dissolved, government of these areas being taken over by the bodies of central authorities.

9. On 27 February, 1918, the State Commission for Education issued a decision "On the Elective Nature of all Teaching Posts and all Posts in the Administration of Education". This statute made

it obligatory for all local Soviets to hold elections, not later than the end of July 1918, for all posts in or to do with schools. The purpose of these elections was to democratise the education service, to remove counter-revolutionary elements from the schools, and to draw into school work persons enjoying the trust of the local population.

10. The Decree of the Council of People's Commissars "On Freedom of Conscience, and on Ecclesiastical and Religious Societies" (published in many works under the title "On the Separation of Church from State and Schools from Church") was promulgated on 20 January, 1918. Under the influence of the clergy and of people working through the All-Russia Teachers' Union, in a number of places, assemblies of peasants had passed resolutions asking for the teaching of Scripture to be retained in the schools. But by the end of the teaching year 1917/18 Scripture had everywhere ceased to be taught as a school subject.

11. In the first half of 1918 the following became the accepted system of administration of education: central bodies—the State Commission for Education and the People's Commissariat for Education; then, Departments of Education under the local Soviets, plus elective Councils for People's Education as advisory and controlling bodies attached to each Department of Education.

12. In pre-revolutionary Russia the following system of educational administration prevailed: the central administrative body was the Ministry of Education (set up in 1802); local control was exercised (since 1804) by the Guardians of School Districts; each District covered several governmental units (gubernias), in each of which were set up, in 1874, Directorates of Peoples' Schools, these being in charge of elementary schools. Immediate control of the elementary schools was in the hands of the Inspectorate of Elementary Schools (the office of Inspector was introduced in 1867). By a decision of the State Commission for Education, 21 December, 1917, the Directorates and Inspectorates of elementary schools were abolished. The School Districts were wound up during the first half of 1918.

13. Some of the reforms listed proved to be only temporary. At that period the abolition of examinations, certificates and award of marks was necessary, since they could be utilised by reactionary sections of the teaching profession to hinder the children of working parents gaining entrance to the schools.

14. On 6 August, 1918 Lunacharsky took part in a public debate on the separation of church and state, at which his opponent was Priest Boyarsky. Lunacharsky was an ardent propagandist of atheism. He pointed out that religion was not only a deception but chiefly a "self-deception" on the part of the masses, and that this was why it was essential to fight it first and foremost with ideological weapons.

Lunacharsky repeatedly noted that the struggle against religion in the field of education could in no way contradict the basic theses of the Constitution on freedom of faith. It must not, he said, turn into any form of administrative action or assume the form of crude pressure, but remain strictly a matter of conviction.

On more than one occasion Lunacharsky quoted the words uttered by V. I. Lenin in a speech to the First Congress of Working Women, on 19 November, 1918: "We must be extremely careful in fighting religious prejudices; some people cause a lot of harm in this struggle by offending religious feelings. We must use propaganda and education. By lending too sharp an edge to the struggle we may only arouse popular resentment; such methods of struggle tend to perpetuate the division of the people along religious lines, whereas our strength lies in unity. The deepest source of religious prejudice is poverty and ignorance; that is the evil we have to combat". (V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the First All-Russia Congress of Working Women", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 181.)

15. In 1869 Norway introduced a unified school system, which included what were known as "intermediate" schools (for children aged 9-15, a six-year course), and, following on from these, High Schools (Gymnazias), with a three-year course of study.

16. Lunacharsky is paraphrasing Marx, who said: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point is to *change* it." (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, Vol. 5, p. 8)

17. Lunacharsky speaks of this at greater length in the article "On the Class School" (see pp. 82-109 of this volume).

18. Lunacharsky is referring to Paul Natorp (1854-1924), German philosopher and educationist, a prominent representative of the so-called "social educationists". Natorp, like all the protagonists of "social education", considered that the main task of educational theory was to elucidate what social conditions were most favourable to good education. The aim of education, according to Natorp, was to stimulate the human being to perfect itself morally, this being essential to personal happiness; the best means to achieve this being to develop people's active will and collective consciousness.

19. The All-Union Conference of Workers in Higher Schools, with over 400 delegates taking part—professors, students, staff of the Education Departments of cities which had institutions of higher education—took place 8-14 July, 1918, in Moscow. The aim of the Conference was, in Lunacharsky's words, "to reach agreement with those teaching in higher education on how to bring the higher schools into line with the requirements of the new Russia". (See: *The Commissariat for People's Education. 1917—October 1920. Short Report*, 1920, p. 51). The Conference elected a Commission to work out a Statute on the *Russian Universities*, a draft for which was put forward by the Commissariat for Education.

20. In the summer of 1918 the young Soviet Republic found itself encircled by fighting fronts. A tense struggle was in progress on the Eastern front, in the Urals and Volga areas from which the forces of reaction, internal and foreign, planned to strike at Moscow. At the same time, counter-revolutionary armies intended to free the Russian Tsar Nicholas II, who was under arrest in Yekaterinburg (now Sverdlovsk). The temporary withdrawal of the Red army on the Eastern front had been halted by the end of summer 1918, and in autumn 1918 it went over to the attack.

21. The Conference of Workers in Teacher Training, which considered questions relating to the creation of new training establishments for future teachers, and curricula and syllabi for these, took place on 18-25 August, 1918.

22. On 11, December 1917 the Council of People's Commissars passed a decision "On the transfer to the People's Commissariat for Education of all teaching establishments previously under clerical control". On 5 June, 1918 a decree of the Council of People's Commissars was issued "On the transfer to the People's Commissariat of Education of establishments providing teaching and general education, coming previously under any other departmental auspices".

23. A decree of the Council of People's Commissars, of 16 August, 1918, created the Department of Science and Technology, coming within the apparatus of the Council of People's Commissars. The Head of this Department was appointed by the Council, and the members of its Board by the Presidium of the Council in consultation with the Commissariat for Education.

On Social Education

Speech delivered on 3 November, 1918, in Petrograd

Among the major educational problems raised by the October Revolution, that of social education occupied one of the central places. In Russian educational thought, questions of social education had been most comprehensively treated in the works of the revolutionary democrats, Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1828-1889) and Nikolai Dobrolyubov (1836-1861). The accomplishment of what was needed in social education for the purpose of paving the way for a revolutionary reorganisation of society—this was one of the leitmotifs of their excursions into the educational field.

Lunacharsky advances a step further in dealing with matters of social education. In the speech here published he deals with two main aspects: "for whom is the child educated—for himself or for society", and "who should educate children—the parents or society". Through exposition of the educational ideals and educational practice of the ancient

world, and of the evolving aims and tasks of the bourgeois school, Lunacharsky demonstrates how the concepts of social education have developed and how they are distorted in a society that is "based on inner contradictions", and in which the schools are only "the ante-room of the barracks". Civic education in its full sense can only be envisaged, as Lunacharsky puts it, "where we see citizens being trained by a harmonious society able to create a harmonious individuality". A "normal human society" of that kind is possible only under socialism, and "only under socialism does educational theory find its natural application".

In considering the first and fundamental aspect of the problem, "*for whom* is the child educated—for himself or for society", Lunacharsky stresses that socialist educational thought sees no possible choice of answer. Educating people "*for society*" is required by virtue of the very nature of the socialist order, whose main principle lies in "the community of all for the good of all". In the socialist school "maximal individualism merges naturally with maximal unity".

In answering the second question, "who should educate children—parents or society", Lunacharsky here too stresses that for the socialist system any appearance of choice here is relative. The pressing need to shield children from the influence of the old world's vices demands, in his opinion, extensive development of socialised education. But in saying this Lunacharsky in no way plays down the role of the family. Lunacharsky's standpoint on the necessity of the closest possible concerted action of socialised education and family education has been borne out by the whole practical experience of Soviet education.

The advantages of socialised education (and pre-school institutions were here seen by Lunacharsky as one of the most important factors) were in his view that it creates the most favourable conditions for "speeding up the process of organising the child's inner life along communist lines", that it saves the child from the fatal influence of petty-bourgeois, philistine family life, and finally that it gives women freedom from serfdom in the home and brings them extensively into the building of socialism.

Lunacharsky mapped out the practical ways of extending the sphere of socialised education—ways which have been followed in the subsequent development of the socialist system of education and upbringing: the development of the system of pre-school institutions, the establishment of children's homes for purposes of "social assistance" and the setting up of boarding schools as "educational laboratories"; the trend for schools to become "school plus club" or "all-day schools"; the setting up of "experimental, integrated" (or "all-in") establishments for children and the utilisation of their experience in the search for "the most satisfactory types" of school. The ideas put forward by Lunacharsky in this speech have been widely developed in Soviet educational practice.

1. *Music(al) education* (from the Greek μουσική—all the arts ruled by the Muses, i.e. culture as opposed to technology)—in the Greek educational system that found its finest flowering in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., this included moral, aesthetic, political, and in general cultural education.

2. *Gymnasium*—in ancient Greece, the state educational institution.

3. The educational ideas of Plato (427-347 B.C.) are set out most fully in his *State* and *Laws*, in which he depicts the educational system of his ideal state. The social structure of this ideal state presupposes the existence of three estates: a small caste of ruler-philosophers (and it is their children for whom Plato's educational system is designed); the warriors who are to defend the state; and "the others", with no rights at all, who form the vast majority of the population. The education of the children of the privileged group is of a socialised nature. From their first days, the children are handed over to special educational institutions, where their education and upbringing is entrusted to an "ideal teacher", a man who is in Plato's words "the best of men in all respects", chosen by the rulers from among the "best citizens". (See Plato, *The Republic. Dialogues of Plato*, Vol. 3. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1875) and *Laws* (J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1934)

4. *Humboldt, Wilhelm* (1767-1835)—German philosopher, philologist and statesman; he favoured the creation of a unified school system, the removal of the schools from church control, and the reform of "grammar school" (gymnazia) secondary education. The University of Berlin (now in the German Democratic Republic, and called the Humboldt University) was founded thanks to his efforts.

Humboldt was one of the most eminent representatives of classical humanism in Germany in the early nineteenth century. The goal of history, in his view, was the spiritual formation and development of human individuality in all the fullness of its capabilities. Humboldt saw this ideal of "humanity" actually realised only in classical times.

5. *Foerster, Friedrich Wilhelm* (1869-1956)—German theologian, philosopher and educationist. He viewed the training of character, will and feeling from the standpoint of Christianity.

6. *Smith, Adam* (1723-1790)—Scottish economist and philosopher, prominent representative of the classical school of bourgeois political economy. Marx described him as "the political economist par excellence of the period of Manufacture", (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 239), and Lenin as "the great ideologist of the progressive bourgeoisie", (V. I. Lenin, "The Heritage We Renounce", *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 506).

7. See note 18 to *Speech at the First All-Russia Congress on Education* (first article, in this volume).

8. *Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich* (1746-1827)—Swiss educationist and democrat, one of the founding fathers of the theory of primary education, and author of numerous widely-known works on education: *Leonard and Gertrude*, *Letter to a Friend on a Stay in Stanz*, *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children*, *Swan Song*, etc.

Pestalozzi held that education should aim at the harmonious development of all the powers and abilities of human nature. This requirement is the basis of all the theory and methodology he elaborated concerning primary teaching, which was to include mental, moral, physical and labour education. The leading principle in Pestalozzi's theory of how to teach at the primary stage is his idea of *developing* education: the development of the pupils' thinking powers in the course of their learning, and of their powers of apprehension, and the development of the habit of active application of mind. Pestalozzi was in favour of creating schools which would be accessible to the children of the common people and would answer their requirements and interests.

9. *Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de* (1743-1794)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, mathematician, sociologist, active figure in the French bourgeois revolution of 1789-94. As a member of the Legislative Assembly's Committee on Education, Condorcet produced a plan for the organisation of education for the broad masses of people; this envisaged the creation of a unified school system, with free passage from one stage to the next within it, equality of educational opportunity for men and women, secularisation of the schools, and free education for all. Condorcet stood out for independence of the schools from politics, from the state. His plan was not accepted.

10. *Montaigne, Michel, de* (1533-1592)—French philosopher and writer. In his principal work, the *Essays* (1580), he took an anti-religious stand, demonstrating that religion was an invention intended to be a bridle, keeping the people in check. Montaigne criticised the "estates" or caste system and the whole world outlook of the Middle Ages. Defending the principle of the "natural equality" of people, of the rights of the individual, he called on people to "judge of everything by reason and not by common opinion", to throw off the yoke of accepted authorities and to act like men who weigh everything up and evaluate it in the light of reason, taking nothing on trust. (Montaigne, *Essays*, Paris, 1962)

11. *Lepeletier de Saint-Fargeau, Louis Michel* (1760-1793)—active participant in the French bourgeois revolution, and author of *Plan d'éducation publique* (1793), the most democratic scheme of education of its time. The basic aim of this plan was the introduction of universal free education, the creation at state expense of "houses of national education" (with boarding accommodation), in which all children between the ages of 5 and 11-12 were to be educated. Lepeletier considered that to organise education on these lines would help to overcome social inequality and improve social morals. Lepeletier's plan was approved by Robespierre, but was not passed by the Convention.

12. *Schiller, Friedrich* (1759-1805)—German poet, philosopher and historian, author of the world-famous plays *The Robbers*, *Maria Stuart*, *Intrigue and Love*, *Wilhelm Tell*, etc. Lunacharsky is here referring to the ideas Schiller expressed in his philosophical aesthetic work *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* (1795).

13. *Bebel, August* (1840-1913)—active worker in the German and international labour movement, one of the founders and leaders of Social Democracy in Germany, and of the Second International. Bebel was an inspiring force in the fight to liberate women from the fetters of bourgeois society; his speeches in the Reichstag on women's rights received wide publicity. The idea which Lunacharsky mentions here was put forward by Bebel in his *Woman and Socialism* (1883).

14. *Palestra*—an exclusive gymnastic school in ancient Greece, teaching boys aged 12-16. From the age of 16 or 18 young men from the most high-born families attended the *gymnasia*.

What Is Education?

*Speech delivered at opening of courses for instructors
in extra-mural education, on 20 December, 1919*

Lunacharsky's speech deals with one of the most important socio-educational tasks facing the young Soviet state—that of organising extra-mural or non-school education. Lunacharsky treats this problem with his usual breadth of vision, taking it in all its aspects: political, social, organisational and educational.

The connection between extra-mural education and the revolution follows a socio-educational pattern that has made and makes itself apparent in both past and present times (for instance, in Russia's historical experience and in the experience of many developing countries today). At times of balance in social development, "in normal times", (as Lunacharsky says in the speech), current educational problems are mainly dealt with by the schools, which are socially and educationally "tailored" to fit the society they serve. Major shifts in society, economic and political, in breaking the structure of society also break through the educational system so intimately connected with that structure, and education is faced with tasks which the old schools were not able to accomplish.

In such periods it becomes a starkly obvious necessity to seek for new ways of spreading education, new educational forms. And in the forefront, alongside reform of the schools themselves, stands the task of organising extra-mural education. For a certain period of time these tasks become leading and predominant within the general system of state activities in education.

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 brought extra-mural education forward to be ranked among the prime political and social problems to be dealt with. It was essential, in Lunacharsky's words, to give the people knowledge in order to make it "capable of making use of its own victory".

In the speech here published Lunacharsky demonstrated that, in the vast work of creating a new society and a new man, extra-mural education was a key sector, a sector of "prime, colossal importance"; that it had become "a mighty lever", "a gigantic machinery" for cultural and political enlightenment of the people—the people who had been "kept in dungeons of darkness".

In stressing the importance of the political and cultural tasks of extra-mural education, Lunacharsky notes that it is also "a mighty lever for advancing the re-education, the transformation of those who consider themselves educated people". Drawing in the intelligentsia on a wide scale to take an active hand in operating extra-mural education meant that it too became the object of social education.

Lunacharsky considers the nature, significance and aims of extra-mural education in close interconnection with the general problems of educational philosophy. Lunacharsky poses questions that never lose their actuality: *what is education? who should be considered an educated person?* The brilliant lines in which he gives his answer to these questions have an amazingly modern ring, even today.

In current educational practice extra-mural education has lost the all-embracing scope it had at the time when this speech was made. So far as schools today are concerned, the narrower concept of "out-of-school work", "institutions for out-of-school activities" are more familiar. The term "adult education", which has come into more general use, is also narrower in its scope. These terminological changes reflect the objective process which has made the tasks of extra-mural education more narrowly specific, in step with the gradual solution of what was its main task—raising the cultural level of the people. But over recent decades, those of the scientific and technological revolution, a renewed tendency has appeared to give a wider interpretation to extra-mural education (in the terminologically up-dated form of "permanent education" or "continuous education").

There is a keenly contemporary ring to Lunacharsky's idea of a never-ceasing process of education, which he sees as the rational and general-cultural source of extra-mural education. Lunacharsky sees continuing education as an unceasing addition to knowledge, dictated by the demands of life which itself is being constantly renewed, also as an expression of the individual's capabilities for creative work and self-development. The schools, Lunacharsky stresses, "give only the keys" to education. They "should teach a person how to work, should establish certain correct methods of approach to the great mystery that is our world", they should

give "the first impetus" towards learning to know its secrets. All the rest is the business of extra-mural education, which in Lunacharsky's words "is life as it is".

1. *Feuerbach, Ludwig* (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher and atheist, forerunner of Marxism.

Lunacharsky has in mind Feuerbach's statement that "God did not create man in his image, as the Bible says, it was man that created god in his own image...." [L. Feuerbach, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Moscow, 1955, *Lectures on the Nature of Religion*, Vol. 2. p. 701 (in Russian).]

2. *Borodin, A. P.* (1833-1887)—eminent Russian composer. Borodin's most outstanding composition is his opera *Prince Igor*, which is a model of national-heroic epic in music.

3. Lunacharsky is quoting the great Russian poet Alexander Pushkin (1799-1837) [a line from his *Epigram (from the Anthology)*.]

4. Lunacharsky is referring to a short story, *Solitude*, by the French writer Guy de Maupassant (1850-1893), in which he depicts the spiritual alienation of man in the bourgeois world.

5. The idea quoted is that of the great Japanese artist Hokusai (1760-1849), who said: "At the age of six I tried to convey correctly the form of things. Over half a century I produced many pictures, but until I reached the age of seventy I did not achieve anything of importance. At 73, I was studying the structure of animals, birds, insects and plants. Thus I can say that until I reach 80 my art will still continue to develop, and by 90 I shall be able to penetrate the very essence of art."

6. *People's Universities*—cultural institutions open to all, one effective means of raising the educational level and satisfying the spiritual needs of working people. The mass provision of People's Universities was a task that the Soviet Union was only able to accomplish some years after the defeat of the nazism in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. People's Universities became widely developed in the 1950s, and by the early 1970s there were about sixteen thousand People's Universities in the country, in which over 3 million people were studying. Particularly popular are the People's Universities for the Study of Education, which account for almost one-third of the total number of students in all the People's Universities.

7. Lunacharsky is referring to the soldiers' uprising in Bulgaria in September 1918.

Communist Propaganda and the Educational System

Article first published in the newspaper Izvestia, on 26 March, 1919

The occasion for the article being written was provided by a discussion in the press on the organisation of political-educational work in the Soviet state. This discussion resulted in the re-organisation, in 1920, of the Extra-Mural Department at the Commissariat for Education, to form the Principal Committee of the Republic for Political Education (*Glavpolitprosvet*); N. K. Krupskaya, (1869-1939), the eminent figure in the Communist Party and in the Soviet state, leading Marxist educationist, V. I. Lenin's wife and closest co-worker, was appointed to lead this body. The above-mentioned occasion for the article's appearance, however, does not fully indicate the scope of the problems it deals with. Beyond the organisational question Lunacharsky sees the larger political and social-educational problem, a most important problem for the entire educational work of the Communist Party, and it is this problem which he takes to provide the main heading and title of the article *Communist Propaganda and the Educational System*.

In telling and practised formulations Lunacharsky summarises in this article the arguments he has previously stated on the class nature of education, and sets out the aims and tasks of the educational policy of the Soviet government. Considering education as "an important weapon of class struggle in the hands of the proletariat", as an instrument of class propaganda, he emphasises that education both within the schools and outside them must be informed by "the spirit of scientific socialism", must serve the aims of the building of communism.

1. *Personal equation* (or *personal error*)—a term used in astronomy, to indicate a systematic error of the observer in fixing the moment of a heavenly body passing through the field of telescope, sextant or other astronomical instrument; this error depending on the particular characteristics of the observations, their mode of registration, and the personal qualities of the observer. Lunacharsky uses the term to indicate the personal attitudes of the worker studying social phenomena.

2. Lunacharsky has in mind the following words of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), a figure prominent in the German labour movement: "The fourth estate, in whose heart there can be not even the least, embryonic trace of privileged attitudes, is for that very reason synonymous with all humanity.... When the fourth estate rules the state, that will bring with it a flowering of morality, culture and science such as has never been seen in history."

The Tasks of Extra-Mural Education in Soviet Russia

*Speech delivered at the First All-Russia Congress
on Extra-Mural Education, on 6 May, 1919*

The First All-Russia Congress on Extra-Mural Education took place in Moscow from 6 to 19 May, 1919. About eight hundred delegates attended the Congress. V. I. Lenin addressed the Congress twice. The Congress considered a wide range of questions in the field of extra-mural education, and passed a number of resolutions: on the liquidation of illiteracy; on the creation of a state system of institutions for extra-mural education, etc. A special resolution was passed on the current situation.

The current situation at the time the Congress met was the grim one of the Civil War, the days of terrible danger hanging over the head of the young Soviet republic. In the spring of 1919 the united forces of outside intervention and internal counter-revolution began a new offensive, on a wider scale than all preceding ones. Taking part in this, besides the Russian White Guard armies, were troops from Britain, France, Poland, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Greece, Roumania, and the bourgeois Baltic states. Describing the alarming military situation at the time of the Congress, Lunacharsky remarked that the very calling of the Congress was profoundly symbolic, indicative of the "might of our movement" and of the fact that the task of developing education in the country was as important as gaining victory over the forces of counter-revolution.

Lunacharsky's speech at the Congress was intended, in his own words, to show "the immense breadth and importance" of extra-mural work, and to map out "at least the central problems" which the Congress was called on to solve. This practical aim determined Lunacharsky's approach to the matter of extra-mural education. In contrast to the speech *What is Education?*, which reviewed the philosophic, social-political and general cultural aspects of extra-mural education, Lunacharsky concentrates here on the practical side of the question. The main points in the speech here published are the actual tasks facing extra-mural education, its organisation and its content, its means and its forms, the difficulties standing in the way of its development and the measures needed to overcome them.

The principal tasks of extra-mural education as Lunacharsky saw them were "to ensure the right and the obligation of every person to be literate" ("the daily bread of extra-mural education in Russia"); to popularise science and art; to spread technological knowledge; and to develop physical education. All this "immeasurable field" of extra-mural work should also be, in his words, "shot through with the scarlet thread of political propaganda".

In sketching out the way forward to the solution of the

problems of extra-mural education, Lunacharsky makes his own contribution to clarifying theoretical understanding of them too. He expresses a great many valuable opinions, which still retain their force even today, on the content of extra-mural education, its didactic foundations, its methods.

On the theoretical side, of particular interest today are the brilliant pages devoted to the socio-educational and socio-psychological role of art, to the tasks of extra-mural education "in the matter of art". Of equal interest, in the light of contemporary ideas on "continuous education", is the interpretation advanced by Lunacharsky of the concept of education itself, and his views on the tasks of extra-mural education.

The First All-Russia Congress on Extra-Mural Education played a most important part in developing a broad movement, with general public participation, to get rid of illiteracy throughout the country. Those taking part in the Congress addressed a request to the Council of People's Commissariats to issue a decree on obligatory liquidation of illiteracy among the adult population (up to the age of 50) and among young people not attending schools. A draft decree was produced by the People's Commissariat for Education towards the end of 1919, and on 26 December of that year the Decree On the Liquidation of Illiteracy among the Population of the Russian Federation was signed by Lenin. This was the first state intervention of the Soviet government on instruction *for all*—a unique, amazing manifesto on revolution in culture. The decree marked the beginning of a mass onslaught on illiteracy, of energetic, planned action by the Soviet state on this sector of the cultural front.

The Soviet government not only defined the liquidation of illiteracy as a task laid upon the whole of the people, it also provided the conditions essential for its execution. Throughout the country, instruction was to be given at state expense. The Commissariat for Education received the right to call upon the whole literate population to take part, as an obligatory national service, in the teaching of the illiterate. The working day for all those being taught to read and write was shortened by two hours, without loss of pay. The establishments controlled by the Commissariat were empowered to make use of all premises suitable for teaching purposes—in factories, offices, clubs, private houses etc. The Decree prescribed wide involvement in the work of liquidating illiteracy of local branches of the Communist Party, the trade unions and the Young Communist League, the Commission for Work among Women, and other organisations. The body in charge of the nationwide movement to liquidate illiteracy was the All-Russia Extraordinary Commission for the Liquidation of Illiteracy, set up at the People's Commissariat for Education on 19 June, 1920.

1. The First All-Russia Congress on Pre-School Education took place in Moscow in April 1919.

2. *Ricardo, David* (1772-1823)—English economist, the ideologist of the industrial bourgeoisie in the struggle with the land-owning aristocracy during the period of the Industrial Revolution. Karl Marx said that Ricardo "gave to classical political economy its final shape". (Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Moscow, 1971, p. 61).

3. *Malthus, Thomas Robert* (1766-1834)—English economist, clergyman, founder of Malthusianism, a doctrine of vulgar sociology. In his *Essay on the Principle of Population* he expounded views which later became widespread in bourgeois social thinking, especially in the late nineteenth century ideas on political economy.

Lunacharsky is referring to what Marx said about Malthus in *Theories of Surplus-Value*:

"The scientific conclusions of Malthus are 'considerate' towards the ruling classes in general and towards the reactionary elements of the ruling classes in particular; in other words he falsifies science for these interests." (Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, Moscow, 1975, p. 120.)

4. N. K. Krupskaya in her speech of welcome which opened the Congress stressed the need for close links between extra-mural education and political education of the masses. Krupskaya proposed that political guidance in the affairs of extra-mural education in the Republic should be entrusted to the Extra-Mural Department of the People's Commissariat for Education, which should likewise be responsible for coordinating the various sectors of extra-mural work. Krupskaya's proposals envisaged the creation of a unified state system of extra-mural education which would provide a basis for unification of all cultural and educational work throughout the country. These proposals were embodied in the Theses on the Organisation of Extra-Mural Education in the Russian Federation which were approved by the Congress.

On the Class School

*Lecture delivered on 26 April, 1920 for the branch
of the Commissariat for Education at the Sverdlov University*

In the work here published Lunacharsky dispels widely held illusions that the state is above classes, and discloses the class purposes and class nature of state institutions—church, army, press, bourgeois government. And among these emerges, in sharp definition, the social role of the bourgeois school as "an instrument for distorting the consciousness of the masses".

As enlightenment and culture progresses, the bourgeois school performs its social function, as Lunacharsky says, with ever-decreasing success. "Science," he says, "has always impelled people towards socialism, if they were honest and took a sufficiently wide view of things." This is why all progressive educational theories have, in his opinion, socialist ideas as their kernel. And this is why the bourgeoisie is not in-

terested in creating a truly scientific school system.

To the bourgeois school Lunacharsky counterposes the communist school. He formulates the ideal and the aims of the unified, polytechnical labour school, and maps out the practical ways forward to their attainment, bearing in mind the difficulties the country had to live through and the experience, too, which had been built up over the two years that had passed since the declaration that the unified labour school was to be.

In his lecture Lunacharsky gives, for the first time, a detailed exposition of his views on labour education (education "through labour" and education "for real labour"), and of his concept of polytechnical education. The central point to which attention is directed is, first and always, the educational importance of labour, the beneficial educational effects of labour. If there is labour done without these effects benignly achieved, then that is, in his words, "a crime perpetrated by the school". Lunacharsky analyses the different forms of labour used in schools, the different methods of labour education applied, and defines the principles and organisational lay-out of labour training and polytechnical education for schools of various grades.

The ideas Lunacharsky expresses in this work have not lost their significance today. The resolution passed in December 1977 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR and by the USSR Council of Ministers "On the Further Improvement of the Instruction and Education Given to Pupils in General Schools, and Their Preparation for Working Life", lays particular emphasis of the importance of "preparing school students for useful, productive labour", and outlines a broad curriculum of labour education and instruction in the general school (see *Pravda*, 29 December, 1977).

[*The Sverdlov University* (the Communist University named after Yakov Sverdlov) was the first establishment for higher Party education; it trained cadres for work in the Party and in Soviet governmental posts. It was created in 1919, on the basis provided by the courses for Party propagandists and lecturers, under the auspices of the Party's All-Russia Executive Committee; these had been initiated by Yakov Sverdlov (1885-1919), Chairman of the Executive Committee and outstanding figure in the Communist Party and the Soviet state. The first curriculum for the University was drawn up by Sverdlov and approved by Lenin. In 1939 the University was reorganised to become the Higher Party School and in 1978, the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU.]

1. Briand, Aristide (1862-1932)—French statesman and diplomat. From the 1880s onwards took an active part in the socialist movement. Elected as a parliamentary deputy in 1902, became a member of the bourgeois government in 1906, and was in consequence

expelled from the Socialist Party. Between 1909 and 1931 he held the post of Prime Minister eleven times.

2. *Chernov, V. M.* (1876-1952)—one of the leaders and theoreticians of the Social Revolutionary party (the SRs). In 1917 was Minister of Agriculture in the bourgeois Provisional Government, and carried out ruthless repressive actions against the peasants. After the October Revolution he was one of the organisers of anti-Soviet revolts. In 1920 he emigrated abroad, where he continued his anti-Soviet activities.

Tsereteli, I. G. (1882-1952)—in May-June 1917 was Minister of Postal and Telegraphic Communications, and later Minister for Internal Affairs, in the bourgeois Provisional Government. After the triumph of Soviet power he went into emigration abroad.

3. *Konovalov, A. I.* (b. 1875)—textile manufacturing magnate in the old Russia, Minister for Trade and Industry and, later, Deputy Prime Minister in the bourgeois Provisional Government. Emigrated after the October Revolution.

Lvov, G. E. (1861-1925)—Prince in the old nobility, owner of great landed estates; in March-July 1917 Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Internal Affairs in the bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Revolution went into emigration and took part in the organisation of armed intervention against Soviet Russia.

Tereshchenko, I. I. (b. 1888)—millionnaire, magnate of the sugar industry. In 1917 was Minister of Finance and, later, Minister for Foreign Affairs in the bourgeois Provisional Government. In emigration after 1917, was one of the organisers of armed intervention against the Soviet state.

4. *Lloyd George, David* (1863-1945)—English statesman, diplomat, and leader of the Liberal Party. Member of Parliament from 1890, Minister of Trade 1905-08, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1908-15, Prime Minister 1916-1922.

Lloyd George was the most colourful exponent of the bourgeois system of deceiving the masses of the people by demagoguery. "I would call this system Lloyd-Georgeism," wrote Lenin in 1916. "after the English Minister Lloyd George, one of the foremost and most dexterous representatives of this system in the classic land of the 'bourgeois labour party'. A first-class bourgeois manipulator, an astute politician, a popular orator who will deliver any speeches you like, even r-r-revolutionary ones, to a labour audience, and a man who is capable of obtaining sizable sops for docile workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, etc.) Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly, and serves it precisely among the workers, brings its influence precisely to the proletariat, to where the bourgeoisie needs it most and where it finds it most difficult to subject the masses morally." (V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism. Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 117-118.)

Millerand, Alexandre Etienne (1859-1943)—French politician, in the 1890s joined the Socialists and took the lead in the opportunist wing of the French socialist movement. In 1899 took office in a

reactionary bourgeois government, where he worked together with General Galliffet (1830-1909), butcher of the Paris Communards, who was given the post of War Minister.

It was this action of Millerand's that gave rise to the concept of Millerandism or ministerism, "ministerial socialism"—a form of political collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the part of leaders of socialist parties. In 1908 Lenin called Millerandism in France, "the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale...." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 37).

In 1904 Millerand was expelled from the Socialist Party; in the period 1909 through to 1915 he occupied various ministerial posts, and from 1920 to 1924 was President of the French Republic.

5. *Kautsky, Karl* (1854-1938)—one of the leaders and theoreticians of German Social-Democracy and of the Second International, to begin with a Marxist, later a traitor to Marxism; the ideologist of the most dangerous and harmful variety of opportunism—Kautskyism, which recognises the truth of Marxism in words, but in deeds takes the direction of apologia for capitalism, denial of the class struggle and of the socialist revolution. After the October Revolution Kautsky came out against Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Kautsky's retreat from Marxism was laid bare by Lenin in *The Collapse of the Second International* (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 207-259) and in *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 227-325) also in a number of other works.

6. Lunacharsky is alluding to the expression used by the great Russian satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826-1889), who repeatedly ridiculed the "educational" policy (in Russian "policy of *enlightening*"—*Trans.*) of the tsarist government and the activities of its Ministry of Education.

Lenin also frequently used the same expression. In the article *On the Policy of Ministry of Education* (written in 1913) Lenin noted that "our Ministry of (forgive the expression) 'Education' has the sole aim of *darkening* national consciousness and *concealing* the beggarly state of public education in Russia". "The Ministry of Public Miseducation," Lenin emphasised, "is in essence a ministry of police surveillance, making a mockery of young people and abusing the desire of the people for knowledge." The Ministry's policy proved for all to see that "there is no more virulent, more irreconcilable enemy to enlightenment of the people in Russia, than the Russian government".

7. The figures quoted by Lunacharsky are actually rather higher than they should have been. The first universal census of the Russian population, made in 1897, showed that only 3 persons out of 100,000 coming from the rural classes had higher education, and only one out of a thousand had secondary education. As was rightly remarked early in the twentieth century, "the influence of the

schools touched to any very noticeable degree only the upper, well-to-do strata of the peasant world; the poor got only the crumbs from the humble table which the schools offered to the people".

8. *Paulsen, Friedrich* (1846-1908)—German philosopher and educationist, professor of the University of Berlin. He directed his attention mainly to problems of the inter-relationship and inter-dependence of ethics and education, and to seeking ways of educating the human being as part of the social whole. He was in favour of renewing the content of education by bringing in the latest data of scientific research, and by using more active teaching methods.

The ideas quoted by Lunacharsky are set out in Paulsen's *Pedagogics*.

9. See Note 5 to article "On Social Education".

10. *Buisson, Ferdinand* (1841-1932)—French educationist and active public figure; in 1879-1896 was director of elementary education in France, and from 1896 held the Chair of Education in the Sorbonne; was one of the initiators of the school reforms of the end of the nineteenth century (the laws providing for free education, for secular education, etc.). He spoke out in favour of the separation of school from church, and of excluding religion from the school curriculum. He was the Editor of a four-volume *Dictionary of Education and of the Primary School* which was published in the 1880s.

11. The circular "on the children of cooking women", as it became known, was issued on 18 June, 1887 by Minister of Education I. D. Delyanov. This circular raised the fees for study in places of secondary education and recommended a purge of pupils, "without due regard being paid" to existing rules and regulations; it also required the Guardians of School Districts to meet with "a firm refusal" any requests from "persons without means or without sufficient means" that their children should be accepted for places in *gymnazii* (secondary schools). "Given unwavering application of this rule," the circular noted, "the *gymnazii* and their preparatory departments will be spared the presence within them of the offspring of coachmen, footmen, cooks, washerwomen, small shopkeepers and suchlike persons, whose children it is not at all desirable—with the possible exception of those gifted with special abilities—to bring forward out of the sphere of life to which they belong."

12. *Classical education*—type of general secondary education based on study of the ancient Greek and Latin languages and their literatures. In the *modern* ("real") system there was no teaching of the ancient languages, and the main attention was given to study of the basis of the natural sciences, mathematics and physics, and to modern languages.

In Russia the idea of classical education began to spread from the seventeenth century onwards. But up to the middle of the nine-

teenth century the teaching given in secondary schools was of a mixed character: one can see in it features belonging to both the classical and the modern systems. The tendency to stress the classical side appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century. The emphasis on classical education went side by side with the stricter class criteria in selection for secondary education.

The reactionary "school reform" of 1871-72 confirmed the classical *gymnazia* as the only fully-recognised type of Russian secondary school, giving the right of entry to university. The "modern" schools brought into being by the same reform did not give their pupils this right. Underlining the political significance of this ruling, the then Minister of Internal Affairs P. A. Valuyev wrote to Alexander II as follows: "The modern system of education has always and everywhere given greater scope to the spread of materialism and of crude socialistic ideas than has the classical system." The establishment of classical education, in Valuyev's opinion, was to make secondary education "healthier" in those places where "social theories have taken the place of the sciences, materialism has crowded out religion, and political ambitions have replaced serious educational work".

In line with this political attitude, classical education in the Russian schools was given an extremely formal, "grammarian's" approach. Its function was to turn the pupils' attention away from the pressing problems of contemporary life, to avert any awakening of civic conscience in Russia's young people, and furthermore to act as a filter to stop propertyless youngsters getting to university.

"Classical education" remained the predominant type of secondary education in Russia right up to the Great October Socialist Revolution.

13. Lunacharsky is quoting from memory Paulsen's book *A Historical Outline of the Development of Education in Germany* (Moscow ed., 1908, cf. pp. 229-235, 234-258.)

14. Lunacharsky has in mind the events of 1917 in Moscow. The action of counter-revolutionary forces in Moscow was supported by organised groups of bourgeois students.

15. *Rousseau, Jean-Jacques* (1712-1778)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, writer, educationist.

Rousseau's educational views found their fullest expression in the novel *Emile or On Education*. Rousseau was criticising the feudal upper class system of education, which crushed the individuality of the child. Considering freedom to be a natural right of man, he advanced the idea of free education, which would bring out all the good naturally latent within the child. Rousseau condemned authoritarianism in education and stressed that one must not train a child to obey blindly what adults tell it to do. He was an enemy of dogmatism and scholasticism, and a partisan of the need to develop children's powers of independent thought. Rousseau attributed particular importance to moral education, which he saw as closely connected with education through work.

Rousseau's educational ideas, inspired by humanist and democratic attitudes, had a great influence on the development of progressive educational theory and practice in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

16. See Note 8 to article "On Social Education".

17. *Herbart, Johann Friedrich* (1776-1841)—German idealist philosopher, psychologist and educationist. He attempted, on the basis of the data provided by philosophy and psychology, to provide a theoretical foundation for educational ideas: philosophy, in Herbart's presentation, points out the aims of education, and psychology indicates the means to their attainment. The main aim of education Herbart saw as bringing the human will into harmony with ethical ideals, and developing a wide range of interests in the human individual. The aim, in his opinion, can be attained by means of "directing children", by elevating instruction and moral training.

Alongside many positive ideas, Herbart's concept of education—in particular, his theory of moral education (which was directed towards inculcating "moderation" and a sense of humility, of dependence upon higher forces) included, in his theory of "directing children", (which consisted mainly in the suppression of the child's "wrong will" or wilfulness) elements which often predominated and gave his educational system as a whole a conservative character. These conservative elements were widely developed by Herbart's successors, who used his ideas to justify the concept of authoritarianism in education. It is hardly accidental that "Herbartist" educational ideas were very popular, in the second half of the nineteenth century, in the governmental circles of many countries.

18. *Froebel, Friedrich* (1782-1852)—German educationist, pupil and disciple of Pestalozzi, the theoretician of pre-school education. In 1837 he opened an establishment "for the play and occupations of younger children" to which he gave the name "kindergarten". A child, in Froebel's opinion, is a growing plant (hence the name "children's garden"); the aim of the kindergarten was to assist the development of natural powers and individual characteristics in children, to satisfy their need for activity in concert with their peers.

Froebel carried on active propaganda for the creation of kindergartens, and trained women teachers for work in them. Kindergarten, based upon the idea of all-round development of the child by means of play and exercises of various kind, found wide acceptance and development in many countries throughout the world.

19. In pre-revolutionary Russia there were about a hundred different types of "people's" primary schools, and none of them had any connection with the secondary schools. Secondary education, to say nothing of higher education, was the privilege of the prop-

ertied classes. Only a tiny number of children of working parents succeeded in getting into secondary schools. The census of 1897 showed that in establishments of secondary education for males those of peasant origin made up only 7.7 per cent of the total number of pupils, and in establishments for females—only 6.4 per cent.

The October Revolution removed all privileges in the matter of education. In accordance with the directive "On the Universal Labour School in the Russian Socialist Federated Republic", issued on 16 October, 1918, a unified labour school providing a nine-year course was created, divided into two grades: the first for children from 8 to 13 years of age, and the second for those from 13 to 17. From the school year 1932-33 the length of course in the general schools was increased to ten years.

20. *Croquis* (French)—a quickly made draft for a drawing, whether mechanical, topographical or artistic.

21. Lunacharsky has in mind the disciples of Tolstoy—a religious, Utopian social trend which came into being in Russia at the close of the nineteenth century, under the influence of the great Russian writer Lev Tolstoy (1828-1910). The Tolstoyans proposed to transform society through moral self-perfecting and teaching "universal love", "nonviolent resistance to evil", and moral purification through physical labour. Lenin wrote that the Tolstoyans "had converted the weakest side of his doctrine into a dogma" (Lenin, *Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution, Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 206).

22. *Blonsky Pavel Petrovich* (1884-1941)—Soviet educationist and psychologist. From the first days of Soviet power he played an active part in transforming the schools and in elaborating the theoretical foundations of Soviet thinking on education and psychology. The book by Blonsky to which Lunacharsky refers, *The Labour School* (1919), had a great influence upon the formation of the ideas and principles of the polytechnical labour school.

Kalashnikov, Alexei Georgievich (1893-1962)—Soviet physicist, teacher, educationist; editor of the first Soviet *Educational Encyclopaedia*, in three volumes (1927-29). Worked on problems of educational theory, of the polytechnical labour school, and of teaching method for physics in the secondary school and in higher education. Lunacharsky is referring to Kalashnikov's brochure *Problems of the Industrial Labour School of the Immediate Future*, which came out in 1919.

23. *Narkomzem*—the People's Commissariat of Agriculture, one of the eighteen People's Commissariats (or "Narkoms") which under the 1918 Constitution of the Russian Federation were the central bodies of departmental administration.

The first People's Commissariats were formed by the directive "On the Establishment of a Council of People's Commissars", which was approved by the Second Congress of Soviets on 26 October

(8th November new style), 1917. The Council of People's Commissars—the first Soviet government—was headed by V. I. Lenin.

24. The Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), which took place in March 1919, approved a new (second) Party Programme (the first Programme of the Party had been approved by the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party, held in Brussels and in London in July/August, 1903).

The new Programme indicated, among other things:

"In the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the period of preparation of the conditions required for full realisation of communism, the schools must be not only a means of communicating the principles of communism in general, but also of bringing the ideological, organisational and educative influence of the proletariat to bear upon the semi-proletariat and the non-proletarian strata of the working masses, in order to bring up a new generation capable of finally achieving communism."

The Role of the Workers' Faculties (Rabfaks)

The article was first published in the journal Vestnik Rabochikh Fakultetov

(Messenger of the Workers' Faculties),

No 1, 1921, pp. 3-7.

The rules governing entry to places of higher education which were approved by the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Federation in August 1918 marked the beginning of a radical restructuring of higher education, and opened its doors wide, giving as it did the right of entry to any place of higher education to all persons, irrespective of nationality or sex, who had attained the age of sixteen. But the abolition in law of the limitations on entry previously in force was insufficient in itself, for a long time to come, to be effective in breaking down the class character of higher education. It was essential to create the actual conditions needed for democratisation of higher education—to organise speeded-up preliminary instruction for entrants drawn from the workers and peasants, and, in addition, to change the internal framework of life in places of higher education. With this aim in mind, it was decided to open preparatory courses starting in the autumn of 1918.

The working experience of these courses soon showed that even if the first task—preparing workers to enter higher education—had been solved, the second still remained—the courses had practically no influence upon the life of the higher schools. Having been set up outside the latter, they were in practice cut off from them, and were unable to change their atmosphere to any great extent. The way out of the dilemma was found by the workers themselves. "The young Party comrades of the Zamoskvoretsky District," wrote Lunacharsky in his report on the work of the People's Com-

missariat for Education over the years 1917-1920, "came up with an idea: why prepare workers for university *outside* the university? Would it not be simpler to take them in there, and make the university prepare its own future students, there on the spot?" (See *The People's Commissariat for Education, 1917—October 1920. A Brief Report*, 1920, p. 59). This was the origin of the "rabfaks" or Workers' Faculties. The first of them was opened at the beginning of 1919, on the initiative of the workers of Zamoskvoretsky District, at the Institute of Commerce, which was simultaneously re-formed as the Karl Marx Institute of the Economy.

On 11 September, 1919 the People's Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation approved a directive On the Organisation of Workers' Faculties within the Universities. The system of Workers' Faculties was legally formulated on 17 September, 1920 by the decree On Workers' Faculties issued by the Council of People's Commissars. The article here published was written by Lunacharsky soon after the publication of this decree, for the purpose of elucidating the aims and the special characteristics of the faculties, these new educational institutions.

In the article Lunacharsky sets out the three basic tasks of the Workers' Faculties: 1) to provide "by-pass routes" to bring new recruits into higher education; 2) to "proletarianise" higher educational institutions by bringing in "fresh forces" and "new blood" to the universities and other establishments of higher education; 3) to change the internal functioning, "the actual morphology" of these establishments—from their general ideological atmosphere to actual curricula and methods of teaching. In the Workers' Faculties Lunacharsky sees not only a means of "conquering the universities from without", but likewise a weapon for "conquest from within", for bringing about "a shift in all the values accepted within the universities". That is why the Workers' Faculty, in Lunacharsky's opinion, had to become "an integral, fully valid part of the university, a living organ of that body".

This short article of the role of the Workers' Faculties brings out in full measure one of the basic characteristics of Lunacharsky's educational creativity, of his contribution as a leader in the educational field. It offers a brilliant example of analysis of social and educational facts and processes, and a lesson in active intervention in these processes, in how to take up and develop a valuable initiative coming from below, from the masses.

The issue of the Workers' Faculties remained constantly within Lunacharsky's field of vision. He believed that in time (when the class structure of society would have altered, and with it the social composition of the student body) the need for Workers' Faculties would disappear. But at the period when these Faculties were set up they played a unique role. Lunacharsky defines this role as "a kind of academic Octo-

ber Revolution". "The irruption of the proletarian mass ... into the Russian universities," he wrote, "has made it possible, at last, for this Sleeping Beauty to be awakened, for a start to be made on transforming decisively the method and manner of academic teaching." Having started the "revolution in higher education", the Workers' Faculties brought in "a breath of ozone" to "freshen up" its atmosphere. [*A Brief Report* (as above), pp. 58-63].

By the mid-1920s, graduates of the Workers' Faculties made up 40 per cent of the total number of entrants to places of higher education. By the start of the 1930s, there were over a thousand Workers' Faculties, with over 350 thousand students. In the second half of the 1930s, as general and secondary education became better developed throughout the country, the Workers' Faculties began to lose their importance, their numbers were reduced, and in 1940 they were wound up. In the twenty years of their existence the Workers' Faculties played a major part in bringing to fulfilment the Communist Party's policy of democratising higher education and training cadres to form a worker-peasant intelligentsia.

1. The first Party conference on education, which had the task of preparing materials on "the organisation of educational affairs in the Republic" for the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), took place in Moscow on 31 December, 1920-4 January, 1921. Among bodies participating in its work through representatives were: the Young Communist League, the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, the Commissariats for Education of the Russian Federation and the Ukraine; also taking part were the heads of Education Offices of various areas, and delegates from the Eighth Congress of Soviets. The conference judged it necessary to reduce the term of study in the general schools from nine years to seven. Study in these schools would thus continue not up to the age of seventeen (as had been envisaged in the Party programme approved by the Eighth Congress of the Party), but up to the age of fifteen. This reduction in the school-leaving age was made necessary by the prevailing economic difficulties, but the conference committed the error of attempting to justify this temporary measure on theoretical grounds.

V. I. Lenin, who owing to illness was unable to be present at the conference, condemned this attitude out of hand, and pointed out the inadmissibility of theorising about "polytechnical or monotechnical" education. "While we are temporarily compelled," wrote Lenin in the article "On the Work of the Commissariat for Education", "to lower the age (for passing from general polytechnical education to polytechnical-vocational training) from seventeen years to fifteen, the Party must consider this lowering of the age as 'only' (Point 1 of the Central Committee's instructions) a practical expedient necessitated by the country's poverty and ruin." (V. I. Lenin, "The Work of the People's Commissariat for Education", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 124).

Vague arguments striving to "justify" this reduction were "nothing but nonsense..."

2. The Central Board for Vocational Training of the People's Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation was in existence from 1921 to 1929. Its main functions were the organisation of training of workers, and of specialist workers with secondary or higher educational qualifications, for all branches of the national economy, also the reform of higher education and the creation of a system of vocational training at basic and secondary levels.

What Kind of School Does the Proletarian State Need?

Lecture delivered at a debate

in the House of Soviets on 4 December, 1922.

First published in the journal Vestnik Prosveshcheniya (Education Messenger) No. 10, 1922, pp. 1-29

The disastrous economic conditions within the country, produced by the First World War and made worse throughout the course of the Civil War, were among the greatest hindrances barring the way of the Soviet State's development. With industry and agriculture in decline, the Soviet Government was faced with the task of evolving a political line which would ensure the quickest possible restoration of the country's economy. The line found was what became known as the New Economic Policy (NEP), which began to be applied in 1921, on the decision of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), and which resulted, in the second half of the 1930s, in the triumph of socialism in the USSR.

The scientific basis of NEP was given by V. I. Lenin. Its essence lay in strengthening, on an economic basis, the alliance between socialist industry and peasant petty-commodity production, by means of giving wide scope to money-commodity relationships, and by drawing the peasantry into socialist construction. NEP allowed of some development of capitalist elements, of a broadening of market relations, while retaining control from outside in the hands of the socialist state.

The freedom allowed to capitalist elements, within certain limits, was a temporary retreat. The Eleventh Congress of the RCP(B), which took place in 1922, announced that this retreat was now at an end. In 1922-23, a re-grouping of forces took place, and a preparation for launching the attack upon capitalist elements. During the mid-1920s, the share of the capitalist sector in the total trade turnover fell from 41 per cent to 19 per cent. The task of bringing the market under socialist control had been accomplished.

The carrying through of the New Economic Policy made it possible to complete in full the tasks of building the basis of a socialist economy—to revive agriculture and small in-

dustry, and then to restore and develop large-scale industry, to prepare and carry through the socialist re-organisation of agriculture, and thus, in the final result, to create the material and technological basis for socialism.

The lecture here published was given by Lunacharsky at a time when the struggle with capitalist elements was becoming acute, when the offensive against the sphere of private capital was under way. The theme for the debate—"What kind of school does the proletarian state need?"—was seen by Lunacharsky as presenting three aspects: for whom was the new school being created, for the proletariat or for the proletarian state? what sort of school "should be fought for by the proletarian state?" and "what kind of school is possible in the proletarian state?", under the transitional conditions of the building of socialism.

The activation of bourgeois elements while the New Economic Policy was being applied, their increasing influence on the schools, the danger that then appeared of an unduly high proportion of the intake to the secondary schools coming from the better-off strata—all this gave rise to a defensive reaction, an urge to give the schools over in full to the proletariat, to the children of industrial workers. It was this trend that moved Lunacharsky to pose the first of his questions—for whom is the new school being created, for the proletariat or for the proletarian state?

Even putting this—"the schools for the proletariat only"—as an issue on the agenda for discussion, struck Lunacharsky as a gross political mistake "directly against the trend of all our political thinking". Developing Lenin's ideas on the essential nature of the NEP, its aim of achieving the "link-up with the peasantry", Lunacharsky pointed out that the task of the proletariat "was to build its own, proletarian state out of the elements it finds already existing in the country". And it was from these elements that the school needed by the proletarian state was to be built.

In answering the second question—"what kind of school does the proletarian state need to defend?"—Lunacharsky stressed that this had in principle already been answered, in the Declaration on the Unified Labour School, and at that given moment it was the third question which was the most important—"what kind of school is possible in proletarian Russia?"

The idea already developed by him in the foregoing works, on the vital need to define actual ways of realising the ideals of a socialist school, is here given more extended treatment. The basic aim of Lunacharsky's lecture is to mark out distinctly "what milestones, what first and nearest milestones... can be set out to head for along this road, along the line that will enable us to move nearer to the fixed, unchanging ideals of our communist educational vision". And Lunacharsky notes these milestones, maps out a plan for the realisation in practice of the unified labour polytechnical school, in the concrete conditions of the early 1920s.

Realising in practice the principles of the polytechnical labour school Lunacharsky sees as "a revolution, which has to ... take place right inside the schools themselves", and the hardest of all the reforms that have to be made is "the reform of the very soul of the teaching given". In saying this, as in the lecture "On the Class School", he emphasises first and foremost "the educative and social significance of scientifically organised labour", of "the educational effect upon the pupils of labour". This concept of labour is, in Lunacharsky's own words, "one of the most inspiring, important, basic ideas in the field of proletarian educational theory".

The work here printed is equally important in being typical of Lunacharsky himself—Lunacharsky the statesman and the teacher, quick to sense the slightest shifts and turns in socio-educational and socio-psychological processes, and influencing these processes in the right direction in the light of the overall tasks of building socialism.

1. The reference is to the Fifth All-Russia Congress of the Workers' and Peasants' League of Youth, held in Moscow 11-19 October, 1922. This Congress discussed such issues as "The Basic Tasks of Communist Education during the New Economic Policy", "the Education of Working Youth", "Work in the Countryside", etc.

2. Lunacharsky has in mind Lenin's report at the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B), which gave the theoretical basis of the New Economic Policy (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 214-237), also his report at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International "Five Years of the Russian Revolution and the Prospects for the World Revolution" (Op. cit., Vol. 33, p. 418).

3. Working out new curricula and syllabi for the schools was one of the most complex tasks of the People's Commissariat for Education in the 1920s. Curricula and syllabi were more than anything else subject to the influence of the demands set by constantly changing conditions of life, and to the influence, too, of new theoretical concepts. It is thus quite natural that changes in curricula and syllabi were especially dynamic in periods when the old schools were breaking up and the new taking shape. Over the years 1918-1929 curricula etc. were reviewed and made more precise in detail practically every year—in 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1923, 1925, 1927, and 1929.

In 1918-19 the main document affecting curriculum and method was the *Materials on Educational Work in the Labour School*, which defined only the general line and content of instruction. At this period the Commissariat for Education did not consider it necessary to interfere in the educational creativity of teaching collectives, and the main work on curriculum and method took place in the localities. In 1920, the Commissariat produced the first *Recommended Curricula* for schools of the first and second stage, in two versions, "full" and "abbreviated". At the same time *Recommended Syllabi* were published. But these curricula and syllabi were not

obligatory, the schools were able to make considerable alterations to them according to local circumstances.

By 1922, the experience acquired of work in the schools convinced the Commissariat, as Lunacharsky indicates in his report, that it was essential to unify the materials on curriculum and method. In the same year the State Academic Council—the Commissariat's main centre of scientific work on methodology—started on the task of evolving curricula and syllabi that would be the same for all schools.

4. In order to make access to secondary education as widely available as possible to young people in the countryside, the "Schools for Rural Youth" were set up in 1923—these were incomplete secondary schools for general education, based on first-stage schools and offering a three-year course.

5. Lunacharsky is referring to the old alphabetic method of teaching children to read (in Russia this made its appearance in the sixteenth century and continued in use until the mid-nineteenth century), under which the main emphasis was on learning the names of the letters (in this case those of the old Russian alphabet) and reciting these in order as they made up syllables. (The universally known English equivalent in old primers being "The cat sat on the mat"—*Trans.*)

6. *Dewey, John* (1859-1952)—American educationist, idealist philosopher, one of the leading representatives of pragmatism. In schools following the Dewey system there was no constant curriculum with a logical system of teaching the separate subjects; only those things were taught which could be practically applied. Dewey's educational ideas have exerted their influence on the organisation of school education in various other countries also.

7. See Note 1 to the article "The Role of the Workers' Faculties".

8. In his article on "Christianity and Communism" Lunacharsky employed the same image, as follows: "You remember Pompey, who said, 'I have only to stamp my foot, and legions will appear.' He was told, 'Stamp, then,' because even if he had done so, no legion would have appeared anyway." (Anatoli Lunacharsky, *Why Is It Impossible to Believe in God?*, Moscow, 1965, p. 90, in Russian).

9. Lunacharsky is referring to the Fourth Congress of Workers in Education, which took place early in December 1922.

10. In Russian abbreviation *gubono*—the Gubernia (or Province) Departments for Education. The Third All-Russia Congress of heads of such departments was held in Moscow in October 1922. The *gubernias*, (created in the early eighteenth century) remained as the main territorial and administrative units up to the later 1920s. In 1924-1929, under the re-organisation of territorial divisions, they were replaced by Regions, Territories, Districts.

11. *Sotsvos* or *Glavsotsvos*—short for the Central Board for Social Education, a constituent part of the People's Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation, set up in 1921; it dealt with general-educational schools, pre-school institutions, children's homes, and establishments for the socio-legal protection of minors (reception centres, colonies, etc.), also establishments for further training of teachers in service. From 1930 onwards the functions of Glavsotsvos began to be hived off. In 1933 separate boards were set up for primary schools, secondary schools, teacher training, and, later, for children's homes.

12. The Tenth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, held in December 1922, discussed the issue of education and the schools, as being one of the most important and pressing matters for the building of socialism. The Congress addressed an appeal to all working people, calling on them "to give everything possible, in effort and resources, to assist the education of the people, to strengthen the positions of the workers' and peasants' state on this front, henceforward of prime importance".

Lunacharsky made a report to this Congress on 27 December, 1922. In the resolution passed after hearing this, the Congress noted "the heroic work done by the workers in education, who during the grim years of financial crisis remained at their posts and so helped to preserve the network of cultural and educational establishments", and kept the schools in being. The Congress emphasised the need to "make drastic improvements in the material living conditions of workers in the schools ... in order that, as the economic strength of the Republic is built up, there should be a steady corresponding rise in the remuneration of workers in education". (*Education in the USSR*, Coll. Docs., p. 23)

13. Factory Training Schools (*Fabrichno-Zavodskoye Uchenichestvo*)—these came into being in 1918 as a form of vocational training for young people already working in production. In 1921-22, on the initiative of the Young Communist League, a massive build-up of such schools was started, with the purpose of training qualified workers. The Factory Training Schools provided general education, to the level of the primary or first-stage school, as well as vocational instruction.

In 1926, with the start of the socialist reconstruction of the national economy, Seven-Year Factory Schools were set up, which gave vocational qualifications plus seven-year general education. Emphasising the importance in the Factory Training Schools of combining instruction with productive labour, Lunacharsky said that "they provide a model of how to bring all our schooling nearer to the true Marxist school".

In 1960-63 the Factory Training Schools were re-organised as Trade and Technical Colleges (*Professionalno-Tekhnicheskiye Uchilishcha*). In the 1970s, in line with the decisions of the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the CPSU (1971), there has been a wide development of a new form which has more to offer in the field of vocational training for the coming years—the Secondary Trade and

Technical Colleges, which give high-grade technical training and full secondary education at the same time. From the academic year 1970-71 to that of 1976-77, the number of these Secondary Trade and Technical Colleges increased from 615 to 3,086, and the numbers of young people studying in them from 180,000 to 1,477,000 (*The USSR in Figures, 1976*, Moscow, 1977, p. 222).

14. Lunacharsky means the courses training teachers to work in the Factory Training Schools; these were opened in 1921 in the building of the former Empress Catherine's Institute for Daughters of the Gentry—a private, privileged educational establishment for girls from noble families only.

15. In 1920, in the work *Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder* (Part II, "One of the Basic Conditions for the Victory of the Bolsheviks") Lenin wrote: "It is, I think, almost universally realised at present that the Bolsheviks could not have retained power for two and a half months, let alone two and a half years, without the most rigorous and truly iron discipline in our Party, or without the fullest and unreserved support from the entire mass of the working class, that is, from all thinking, honest, devoted and influential elements in it, capable of leading the backward strata or carrying the latter along them... Only the history of Bolshevism during the *entire* period of its existence can satisfactorily explain why it has been able to build up and maintain, under most difficult conditions, the iron discipline needed for the victory of the proletariat." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 23-24).

16. Lunacharsky is quoting from memory a passage from the Naval Code of the Emperor Peter the Great (1672-1725):

"For that the root of evil lies in love of money, so every one holding command ... must guard himself against wrongful taking of monies, and not only himself, but must with severity keep others also from it, and be content with that allotted them. For many state interests are oft lost through his evil ... every commander must hold this continually in mind and abide by it." [See *Ustav Morskoi* (Naval Code), On All that Concerns Good Governance of the Fleet at Sea. St. Petersburg, 1763, Book I, Chap. I, Article 3, p. 3].

The Philosophy of the School and the Revolution

*Speech delivered at a general meeting
of two unions—that of Workers in Education,
and that of Workers in the Arts—on 22 May, 1923, in Tomsk*

The difficulties of the period of reconstruction could not fail to be reflected in the condition of education in the young country of the Soviets. In the years 1921-22 a temporary retreat proved inevitable in education: the number of schools had to be reduced; some out-of-school establishments which

had not sufficient material resources had to be closed; the so-called "contract" schools were introduced, which were maintained by the public, not the state; payment of fees was brought in for schools of the first and the second stage, etc. This situation continued until 1923. Then the general improvement of the economic situation in the country, the restoration of the economy, provided the basis for an improvement in education.

In the article *A Fresh Address to Old Tasks*, noting the start of this new resurgence on the education front, Lunacharsky wrote: "In a whole series of provinces (*gubernias*) a definite upturn has taken place, and we have gone decisively over to the offensive.... We are already addressing ourselves afresh to the old tasks... which were proclaimed by us in the first years of the Revolution" (*Narodnoye Prosveshcheniye* (People's Education), 1923, No. 3, p. 3). Among these tasks, one of the most important was the study of fundamental theoretical problems in the light of Marxism.

The experience in building a new, socialist school, with every hour bringing forth dozens of fresh questions, and—even more important—the sharpening which NEP conditions of life produced in the ideological struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois educational concepts—all this demanded that theoretical stands be clearly defined. It was essential to clarify what was the Marxist understanding of the basic questions of education, which were now the subject of intense discussion: what is education, what is its essential nature, what aims, objects and tasks has it. The work here published is an answer to these questions. Lunacharsky gave a brilliant Marxist analysis of "the philosophy of the school", of the inter-relationship of school and revolution, of "the most important ideas in our basic educational policy". (The way in which Lunacharsky stressed the *policy*—the *politics*—is characteristic. Not just policy for the schools—the principles of building the new school, which he had earlier dealt with on more than one occasion, but *educational policy*, i.e. the Marxist interpretation of the cardinal, fundamental educational problems, and their Marxist solution.)

In dealing with the essence of the above-mentioned problems, Lunacharsky at the same time develops further some ideas he has already put forward, on the nature of the unified labour school. In this present work, as distinct from the earlier ones, he is concentrating attention on the *broadly educational* (not merely instructional) task to be discharged by the school. Under the prevailing conditions of heightened ideological struggle, Lunacharsky brings this task to the foreground, and provides a comprehensive definition of the aim of education, noting also the ways and means needed for its realisation.

In this work we find a further development given to one of Lunacharsky's favourite ideas, that of the essentially socialist nature of the educational ideals common throughout humanity (see the article "On the Class School"). The revo-

lution, he stresses, is the first phenomenon which "clears the way" forward to these ideals, which creates the conditions for their realisation. In bringing these ideals to real life, socialist teachers were together with the revolution bringing about "the only miracle recognised by science—the transformation of man".

1. *The State Academic Council*—the leading centre for scientific methodological studies under the Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation—was set up in 1919. It had sections for research, technological studies, educational studies, etc. The last-named section, created in 1921, was in the charge of N. K. Krupskaya. The section's theoretical publication was *On the Way to the New School* (*Na Putyakh k Novoi Shkolye*).

In 1932 the State Academic Council was abolished, and its functions were taken over by the Council for Teaching Methodology of the People's Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation, by the Academic Council for Methodology and by the specialised Commissions of the Committee for Higher Education.

2. Lunacharsky is referring to M. Jourdain—the hero of Molière's comedy *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*.

3. *The Zemstvo schools*—elementary schools in pre-revolutionary Russia, opened by the *Zemstvos* (local bodies of self-government) in rural localities and maintained from local funds. The *Zemstvos* were created in 1864, and the first of these schools made their appearance in the same year.

In spite of much discouragement from the tsarist government, the *Zemstvo* schools spread widely in a short space of time. The instruction and education they provided was significantly better than that in the government schools under the Ministry of Education and in the parish schools which were run by the clergy.

Many progressive Russian educationists worked in the *Zemstvo* schools. In the Russia of the late nineteenth century the words "*Zemstvo* school" or "*Zemstvo* education" were synonyms of all that was new and progressive in educational theory and practice.

4. See Note 8 to article "On the Class School".

5. See Note 5 to article "On Social Education".

6. The reference is to Lunacharsky's article "A Brief Outline of the History of Education", which appeared in a collection of his work under the title *Problems of People's Education*, Moscow, 1925, pp. 24-50.

7. *Talleyrand, or Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de* (1754-1838)—French diplomat and statesman. The plan for reform of the schools which he put forward in 1791 reflected the ideas of moderate bourgeois circles and was directed against the feudal system of education; it provided that education should be universal and should be secular.

Lepelletier—see Note 11 to article "On Social Education".

Condorcet—see Note 9 to article "On Social Education".

8. *Rousseau*—see Note 15 to article "On the Class School".

Pestalozzi—see Note 8 to article "On Social Education".

Froebel—see Note 18 to article "On the Class School".

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb (1762-1814)—German idealist philosopher, representative of classical German philosophy, professor of the universities of Jena and Berlin. He devoted much attention to both theoretical and practical work in the field of education. In his *Speeches to the German Nation* (1804), Fichte put forward a plan for creating a system of national education which would be the same for all Germans. Particularly interesting are Fichte's ideas on labour education, on the necessity of making children aware of the general scientific basis of labour.

Herbart—see Note 17 to article "On the Class School".

9. Lunacharsky is quoting from memory Martin Luther's words: "So far as I am concerned, if I were obliged to leave preaching and find another vocation, I know of no other work or profession which I should prefer to being a schoolteacher or mentor of boys. For I am convinced that this, after preaching, is the most useful profession; this is the best work out of all the forms of work the world knows, and indeed I am often in doubt as to which profession (preacher or teacher) is more honourable. One cannot, after all, teach an old dog new tricks, and it is hard to reclaim old sinners, and this is in fact what we are hoping to do by our sermons, hence our labour is often in vain; but it is easy to bend and nurture young trees, although in the process some may by accident be broken". (See P. Monro, *History of Education*, Part II, Moscow, 1914, p. 58)

The Tasks of Education Within the System of Soviet Construction

Report delivered at the First All-Union Teachers' Congress

*First published in Uchitelskaya Gazeta (Teacher's Gazette),
on 16 January, 1925*

During the years 1923-25 decisive successes were achieved in the restoration of the national economy. This economic recovery provided the essential basis needed for further cultural and educational development, and in its turn presented the educational world with new tasks, whose solution became an integral part of the work of building socialism. These tasks were discussed at the First All-Union Teachers' Congress, which took place in Moscow on 11-19 January, 1925.

In the expression which it provided of the mood and interests of the broad mass of teachers (out of 1,559 delegates with full voting rights, 72 per cent were rural education workers, and 28 per cent came from the towns), the Con-

gress demonstrated that during the years of Soviet power a radical change had taken place in the political hopes and ideological attitudes of the teaching body, and in the character and direction of its practical work. The Congress summed up the Party's achievements in bringing together ideological and political transformation of teachers. "Wherever we may work," stated the delegates in the Declaration approved by the Congress, "we shall everywhere be the faithful helpers of the Soviet government and the Communist Party in their historic work—historic for the whole world—for we now know that the cause pursued by the Party is the cause of all labouring humanity." [*Narodnoye Prosveshcheniye* (People's Education), 1925, No. 2, p. 170.]

In his guiding report on the new tasks of education within the general system of Soviet construction, Lunacharsky gave a telling outline of the significance of education—for the further strengthening of the country's defensive capability, for the further development of the national economy, and in the creation of new, Soviet intelligentsia. Again, as in his lecture "The Philosophy of the School and the Revolution" (1923), he indicated as the most important task the improvement, in power and depth, of work on the communist education of the rising generation.

Lunacharsky considers all these tasks against the broad background of the general methodological and theoretical problems of education, in close connection with the "philosophy of the school", and develops many ideas already mentioned in the preceding works. This broad approach to the analysis of current tasks connects up not only with the special characteristics of Lunacharsky's creative method, not only with the need for further Marxist elucidation of basic educational problems. It was, also, dictated by the actual make-up of the audience presented by the Congress, by the need for socio-educational, Marxist education of the broad masses of the teachers themselves.

Analysing the interaction, under the new conditions, of the "three fronts"—military, economic and educational—Lunacharsky stresses the ever-increasing part played by the educational or "third front". Whereas earlier, as he puts it, "all three fronts had to be accommodated to the first one", now at the time of speaking "neither the defence of the country, nor government of the state, nor the development of the economy can be envisaged without rapid development of work on the third front".

Lunacharsky sees the immense importance of the "third front" in the fact that it is the basic front of the revolution in culture. Lunacharsky sees the raising of the cultural level of the people as not only a means, but also as the end, the aim, of building socialism.

Having taken the general tasks of building socialism as his point of departure, Lunacharsky then considers concrete matters of school development also: the financing of education; work on curriculum and methods and on moral edu-

cation; the material situation and status of the teacher. In the second part of the report he devotes especial attention to educational work in the countryside. In the light of the resolution approved by the Thirteenth Congress of the Party *On Work in the Countryside* (May 1924), Lunacharsky notes two most important trends in the process of raising the cultural level of the peasantry: changing forms and methods in the work done on doing away with illiteracy, and the struggle against the greater activity of the "kulak movement"—the fight to get the peasants away from this movement. Lunacharsky allots a most important role in this fight to the rural teacher, who is, in his words, "an element of immense importance in the link-up with the peasantry".

Lunacharsky sees the teachers as "a grandiose filter, through which the new life passes", as the chief actor in the revolution in culture, as "the vanguard of the new world, engaged in direct struggle for the new man", as people to whom belongs "an uncommonly hard but uncommonly glorious place in the building of the new culture".

1. Lunacharsky is quoting P. Natorp's *Culture of a People and Culture of the Individual*, which was written shortly before the First World War and was published in Leipzig in 1911. For Natorp, see also Note 18 to *Speech at the First All-Russia Congress on Education*.

2. In *Anti-Dühring*, which appeared in 1878, Frederick Engels wrote that after the accomplishment of the socialist revolution, "man himself, with full consciousness, (will) make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the humanity's leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom". (Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, p. 344).

3. Lunacharsky presented reports to the second session of the eleventh All-Russia Central Executive Committee on 15 October, 1924. In one report he stressed the vital need for all possible assistance being given to the development of education throughout the country.

The Committee in session recognised that improvement of "the material situation of the schools" was "a task not admitting of postponement", and it mapped out a broad programme of measures that would advance the development of the schools. "Bearing in mind that all the measures indicated are impossible of fulfilment on the very limited material basis which was all that education could dispose of during the past year", the resolution stated, "the Executive Committee recommends that local bodies do all in their power towards a further increase in the allocations made for education (in the countryside in particular), and at the same time it considers it essential that in the current year the proportion of

the state budget allocated to the People's Commissariat for Education should be increased." (*Education in the USSR*, Coll. Docs., pp. 24, 27).

4. *Potyomkin villages*—pejorative appellation, alluding to the unreal, "show" villages created by order of Prince G. A. Potyomkin (1739-1791) along the road to be travelled by the Empress Catherine II (1726-1796) when she visited the Crimea in 1787.

5. *Narkomfin*—People's Commissariat for Finance.

6. In the resolution of the second session of the eleventh All-Russia Central Executive Committee the following passage occurs: "The All-Russia Central Executive Committee recognises as essential the establishment, from the academic year 1925-26, of a special school repair fund, to be contributed to both by central and by local budgets" (*Education in the USSR*, Coll. Docs., p. 25). On 9 August, 1926, following a proposal moved by Lunacharsky, the Statute on a Central Loan Fund for School Building in the Russian Federation was also passed.

7. *Gosizdat*—Central State Publishing House of the Russian Federation, the first major Soviet publishing concern, organised in Moscow, under the aegis of the People's Commissariat for Education, on 21 May, 1919. The first head of Gosizdat was Vaclav Vorovsky (1871-1923), prominent Party worker and statesman, publicist and literary critic.

8. *Tsekpros*—Central Committee of the Trade Union for Workers in Education (1922-1934). This trade union covered workers in the schools, kindergartens, children's homes, places of higher education, scientific (research) establishments and political-educational bodies.

9. N. K. Krupskaya, who in the 1920s was at the head of the Central Committee of the Republic for Political Education, also of the Scientific and Educational Section of the State Academic Council of the People's Commissariat for Education, made a report to the First All-Union Teachers' Congress which dealt with the problems of working out new curricula, new textbooks, also new methods and organisational forms of teaching. In this report much space was devoted to matters concerning the Communist children's movement. [See: N. K. Krupskaya, *Pedagogicheskiye Sochineniya* (Educational Works), Vol. 2, Moscow, 1958, pp. 189-203, in Russian].

10. Lunacharsky has in mind the so-called "complex teaching programmes" and "complex method", or "SAC programmes"—since these were worked out by the Scientific-Educational Section of the State Academic Council (SAC); a start was made on introducing these into the schools in 1923.

The essence of the "complex method" lay in the concentration of the teaching material around a basic nucleus of knowledge, which would be linked to subsequent building-up and enrichment of the child's concepts and ideas of the surrounding world. In the opinion of those who drew up the SAC programmes, the latter provided guidelines for synthesis and generalisation from the teaching material, around three basic themes: nature, labour, society. The central feature in the programmes was to be the working activities of human beings, studied in their connections with nature (as the object of those activities), and with social life (as the result of those activities). Thus, in the concept of the programmes' producers, the main aim of instruction would be attained—perception of the phenomena of life in their interconnection and interaction. All the material for the primary school was arranged in these programmes on the principle "from the child to the world", and was studied in outward-extending concentric circles: in the first grade the basic themes were connected with the child's life in the family and in school, in the second grade they studied the life of their village or town, their republic, etc. In the second-stage schools, subject teaching was retained, although even here the study of different disciplines was again concentrated around certain general complex themes.

The SAC programmes had the object of overcoming one of the most marked drawbacks of the old school—the gulf between school learning and life, and the isolation of school subjects one from another. The programmes tried to break down the scholastic, dogmatic system of instruction that had reigned in the old-style school, tried to bring learning close to the child's interests and in accord with the level and character of development proper to the various age-groups. The content of the new programmes was closely linked with the country's economic and political tasks, and was aimed at forming a new, communist world outlook. This was their fundamental virtue, their claim to educational value. However, the new content of the programmes was devalued to a large extent by their "complex" structuring.

The "complex" structure of the programmes deprived the old "school subjects" of their independent existence and qualitative individuality, and replaced systematic study of the fundamentals of science by scraps of knowledge, imparted by the wayside in the course of dealing with this or that "complex". The producers and the ardent supporters of the "complex" programmes tried to show that the principle of "complexity" set the acquisition of information on a sound basis. But the experience of the mass schools bore witness to the opposite. The mass schools did not accept the "complex method". "The majority of schools," stated Lunacharsky in October 1925, "have gone over to subject teaching, while considering nonetheless that they are applying 'the complex', because there are bits of this method stuck into their teaching here and there" (*Education and Revolution*, 1926, p. 399).

The curricula prepared by the People's Commissariat in 1927 abandoned the "complete dissolution of boundaries" between subjects in favour of "living complexes", and this change ensured a perceptible qualitative improvement in the knowledge gained by

pupils. These new curricula became obligatory for the first time, for all schools. The syllabi introduced in the same year were also obligatory.

In subsequent years the curricula of Soviet schools have been re-worked according to the demands made by life, by social and by scientific progress. In 1966 the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU set two supremely important tasks for the schools to meet—realisation of full secondary education for all, and improvement of the content of education, also of the methods used by the schools to impart it. The same year saw a start made on the gradual introduction into the schools of new curricula, produced to keep up with the demands made by contemporary science, technology and culture.

The Twenty-Fifth Congress of the CPSU (1976) noted that the most important task, realisation of full secondary education for all young people in the USSR, had been practically dealt with, and that the schools had successfully carried through the transition to the new content of education.

11. *RKI* or *Rabkrin*—the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection (*Raboche-Krestyanskaya Inspektsiya*)—a state control body set up in 1920, which continued to function until 1934. Later re-organised as the bodies for State, or later State and Party Control, and then, since 1965 People's Control.

12. Lunacharsky is referring to the directive, approved by the Soviet government in 1924, on raising the wages of teachers. On 15 January, 1925, in the course of Congress work, a directive was also approved on pension provision for teachers and other workers in education.

13. In the 1920s, large-scale work was developed on "doing away with illiteracy" (see Notes to article "The Tasks of Extra-Mural Education in Soviet Russia"). One of the forms this took was the development of schools and courses for adults, also of what were known as "Likbez Centres" (from the first syllables of the words *likvidatsiya bezgramotnosti*—Russian for "doing away with illiteracy"—*Trans.*); these were set up on the initiative of N. K. Krupskaya and the Committee which she headed (the Central Committee of the Republic for Political Education, known as *Glavpolitprosvet* for short). In 1924 the Soviet government took the decision mentioned here by Lunacharsky, on the allocation of further funds for setting up Likbez Centres. In 1925, as many as 1,400,000 people were studying at these centres, more than three times as many as in 1922.

14. *The village reading-room*—one of the types of rural cultural-educational institution which arose in the early years of Soviet power. The idea of creating such library-huts was put forward by Lenin. Emphasising the importance of creating support bases for cultural work in the countryside, Lenin remarked in the course of

a discussion with the leaders of the People's Commissariat for Education, that "a permanent place is vital, a cultural centre of sorts, what you might call a village house-cum-reading room, which can subscribe to the peasant newspaper, receive pamphlets, posters, and where the peasant can go in his free time to read the paper or a book, or listen to it being read, and to have a chat . . ." [N. Kolesnikova, *He Taught Us to See the Future*, in *Leninskiye Stranitsy* (Documents, Memoirs, Essays), Moscow, 1960, p. 52, in Russian]. Putting this suggestion of Lenin's into practice, the Commissariat for Education, with the support of the local bodies of Soviet power, had brought 34,000 hut-reading-rooms into being by the end of 1920.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the hut-reading-rooms were the centres of the work of enlightenment in the villages. They played an important part in doing away with illiteracy, in making primary education for all a reality in the countryside, and in helping Soviets and Party bodies to carry through the collectivisation of agriculture.

In later years these reading-rooms were replaced by clubs or by Houses or Palaces of Culture. At the beginning of 1977, there were 135,000 social centres in the USSR, and 114,000 of these were in rural localities (see *USSR in Figures*, 1976, p. 230).

15. Soviet Russia inherited from pre-revolutionary times an extremely insignificant number of pre-school institutions: in 1917 there were only 177 in all, and the number of children attending them was under 5,000. The task of creating a system of pre-school education became, from the first days of Soviet power, one of the most important among the sum total of educational tasks facing the Communist Party and Soviet government. It was vital to define the principles to be followed in building a pre-school education system, what its educational foundations were to be, and it was likewise vital to train cadres of workers for pre-school institutions. Work on all this began as early as 1918, and the first review of its achievements was given by the First All-Russia Congress of Pre-school Education (April 1919), which brought together the creative forces available for theoretical elaboration of the bases of the new, Soviet system of pre-school education.

The Civil War and the difficulties of the first years of the period of reconstruction held up the building of pre-school establishments. In the second half of the 1920s, with the improvement in the economic situation, the question of developing pre-school education was once again brought forward by the People's Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation as one of the first priorities. On a proposal made by A. V. Lunacharsky and N. K. Krupskaya, the Fourth All-Russia Congress of Pre-school Education was convened in December 1928, its object being to rouse public initiative in the matter of "raising the pre-school sector to a higher level".

In his address to the Congress, which was published in *Pravda* on 1 December, 1928, Lunacharsky emphasised the close connection of pre-school matters with the general problems of educating the

new man, problems which by the late 1920s had taken on especial urgency and relevance (see the article "The Education of the New Man" and the Notes to this).

Both in the address to the Congress and in subsequent utterances on the subject, Lunacharsky stressed that "the work of education *must* start at pre-school age", that "the most important, the most fundamental education of all, that which leaves its mark on all later life, is pre-school education".

On 26 June, 1929, on the initiative of the People's Commissariat for Education, a joint conference took place in Moscow which brought together representatives of the central and Moscow-area bodies of the Party, the Young Communist League, and the trade unions, and this meeting addressed an appeal to all working people "to unite their efforts in order to advance pre-school education in the country generally". Speaking to this conference in session, Lunacharsky said: "We expect enormous results from the pre-school campaign.... Revolutionary spring has come late to this street, where the little children live, but now it seems she is with us at last, now she is showing herself, speedy in action, and before long the wide spaces of our land will grow green and break forth in bloom." [A. V. Lunacharsky, *On the Pre-school Campaign*, in *Na Putyakh k Novoi Shkolye* (On the Road to the New School), 1929, No. 7, pp. 10-13].

These words of Lunacharsky found confirmation in the years immediately following. Whereas in 1927 there were 2,100 pre-school establishments (kindergartens and nurseries), with 107,500 children attending them, in 1932 the numbers had grown to 19,600 establishments with 1,061,700 children in them. In subsequent years the number of children receiving pre-school education increased tenfold and more. By the beginning of 1977 there were 117,000 pre-school establishments, with 12,108,000 children attending them.

16. *Kulaks*—a term (literal meaning in Russian—"a fist"—*Trans.*) which first came into use in Russia in the 1890s, to denote the rising rural bourgeoisie, those who rapaciously exploited the poorer peasants. The *kulaks* met the Great October Socialist Revolution with hostility. During the Civil War and afterwards, they became the principal social force representing petty-bourgeois counter-revolution.

In the 1920s, the *kulaks* carried on anti-Soviet agitation and organised "grain strikes", refusing to sell grain to the state at fixed prices. The policy of the Soviet government was to limit the freedom of action of the *kulaks* and gradually edge them out.

The start of collectivisation in agriculture evoked bitter opposition from the *kulaks*. They organised anti-Soviet revolts, murdered the active workers of the collective-farm movement. Given this state of affairs, the Soviet government went over, at the close of the 1920s, to a policy of liquidating the *kulaks* as a class. *Kulaks* were deported from areas due for complete collectivisation, their property was confiscated and handed over to the collective farms as part of their inalienable stock.

The victory of the collective-farm way of life in the USSR res-

cued the peasantry from exploitation by the *kulaks* and did away with the conditions that had made it possible for the latter to come into being.

17. An *S.R.*—member of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which existed in Russia from 1902 till 1922. The *S.R.s* expressed the attitudes and interests of the petty bourgeoisie and of a section of the better-off peasantry. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the leaders of the *S.R.* Party worked to sabotage the Soviet government, organising conspiracies, diversions and rebellions. In 1918 the *S.R.s* organised attempts on Lenin's life, and the murders of other prominent members of the Communist Party. These actions against the Soviet government brought the *S.R.* Party into isolation, and finally to self-dissolution.

The Art of the Word in School

Article first published in the journal Iskustvo v Shkolye (Art in School), May, 1927, No. 1

The "complex" programmes introduced in the schools in the years 1923-25 (see Note 10 to article "The Tasks of Education within the System of Soviet Construction"), viewed the child's native language purely as a technical tool of assistance in studying the "complexes" of phenomena found in life. The natural consequence of such an approach was the implicit denial of any educative, formative role to be played by the native language, and an underestimation of its importance as a subject in its own right, and a most important one at that. The results of this approach were not slow in showing themselves: the level of literacy of school pupils fell considerably, which evoked serious alarm among teachers and obliged the People's Commissariat for Education to review teaching programmes in order to improve the teaching of the Russian language. The new curricula approved by the Commissariat in 1927 treated Russian as a separate subject of study. The publication of the curricula started a broad movement concerned with teaching methods for Russian language; raising the level of literacy of school pupils became a strand of prime importance in the general work of the school.

However, this struggle to raise the level of literacy was only one aspect of the general aim—that "the art of the word" (or as contemporary jargon has it—"language skills"—*Trans.*) should be mastered in school. The article by Lunacharsky here published was devoted to discussing this general aim. In the article Lunacharsky demarcates three objects which should be attained in the course of school study of the native language: "elementary language control, i.e. the acquisition of a certain vocabulary, the ability to construct both spoken and written sentences correctly, knowledge of spelling, etc."; secondly "the ability to use language to describe

the real world accurately or to express a logical train of thought"; and lastly ability in "the artistic use of language". It is on this third task, the most complex and least well discharged one in school practice, that Lunacharsky concentrates his attention in this article.

The central place in the article is occupied by Lunacharsky's recommendations on how to achieve mastery of artistic language, and these retain their interest and relevance even today. Of particular interest is his advice that children should be taught to appreciate "not only the content but also the form" of literary works, that one should "get their attention to dwell on the music, the colour, the expressiveness of this or that phrase; on the plastic and dynamic qualities of this or that figure of speech", and should point out to them "how and by what means this is achieved".

Lunacharsky pays great attention to "the pupils' own efforts", to "drawing them into direct, spontaneous, and by virtue of this invariably artistic narration of these or those events actually experienced by them". Besides this "memoir realism", as Lunacharsky calls it, it is vital also to foster by all possible means the children's imaginative work, which is "a very important educative element". Fantasy, dreaming of dreams "are as it were battle manoeuvres in the mind, a game, an exercise, leading up to the fulness of activity of the mature person".

Lunacharsky directs accentuated attention in his article to educating collective feeling, "socially educated originality". "And the art of the word, more than any other one aspect of school life," Lunacharsky emphasises, "can be a means towards this education of individuality linked in harmony with the other individualities that surround it." These problems of education in collectivism, of the mutual relationship of the collective and the individual, are dealt with more fully by Lunacharsky in other works in this volume, "The Education of the New Man" and "The Educational Tasks of the Soviet School".

1. *Bergson, Henri* (1859-1941)—French idealist philosopher, member of the Académie Française. A central place in Bergson's philosophy is occupied by the problem of creativity. The ability to create, according to Bergson, is connected with irrational intuition, which, like some gift of God, is given only to the chosen few. Bergson counterpoises intuition to intellect, the conceptual mode of thinking, which he considers false, liable to distort reality. Lunacharsky is thinking of his book *Creative Evolution* (1907).

2. *Uspensky, Gleb* (1843-1902)—Russian writer, eminent representative of the democratic trend in Russian literature, author of many sketches and short stories on the life of the Russian countryside and that of the urban poor, also on the spiritual searchings of the Russian intelligentsia. Uspensky's artistic method was marked by its organic synthesis of research in depth, emotionally charged

presentation, and vivid imagery. V. I. Lenin, who had a high opinion of Uspensky's work, remarked that he had "an extraordinary artistic talent that penetrated to the very heart of the phenomena". (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 256)

3. *Pierre Hamp*, (pseudonym, real name *Henri Louis Bourillon*, 1876-1962)—French writer, one of the creators of the "industrial novel"; author of the novels *Fresh Fish*, *Champagne*, *Rails*, etc.

4. *Furmanov, Dmitri* (1891-1926)—Soviet writer, author of the well-known novel *Chapaev* (1923), dealing with the life of the legendary Civil War hero Vassili Chapaev, commander of the division that came to bear his name. In 1919 Furmanov was political commissar in Chapaev's division.

5. The ideas of Lev Tolstoy here referred to by Lunacharsky come from the great Russian writer's tract "What is Art?" (1897-98).

6. *Pushkin, Alexander* (1799-1837)—great Russian poet, the founder of modern Russian literature. The language of Pushkin's works, which combines strict literary standards with the liveliness of actual speech, exerted a decisive influence on the formation of the Russian national literary language, and remains its foundation to this day.

7. *Gogol, Nikolai* (1809-1852)—great Russian writer, the founding father of Russian critical realism. Carrying on the work begun by Pushkin, Gogol himself made a rich contribution to the Russian language.

Sociological Premises of Soviet Educational Theory

Article first published in Pedagogicheskaya Entsiklopediya (Educational Encyclopaedia), 1927, Vol. I, pp. 1-10

The first Soviet *Educational Encyclopaedia*, in three volumes, was prepared for publication in time for celebration of the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. The *Educational Encyclopaedia* was a first attempt to bring together and analyse from a Marxist standpoint the whole range of problems, both theoretical and practical, involved in education in all its aspects. It contained reference material and theoretical background for all aspects of educational thought, on all departments of institutional education and general cultural-educational work. We find contributing articles to this encyclopaedia by the foremost figures in Soviet education: A. V. Lunacharsky, N. K. Krupskaya, P. P. Blonsky, S. T. Shatsky and many others. The appearance of the *Educational Encyclopaedia* was a great event in educational life. It played an important part in providing ideological and theoretical ammunition for the great mass of teachers, and in expounding the Marxist-Leninist foundations of Soviet educational thought.

Lunacharsky's "Sociological Premises of Soviet Educational Theory" was the introductory article in the first volume. It posed a number of most important methodological and theoretical problems which later received treatment in depth in Soviet educational studies. In this article Lunacharsky is the first to introduce the concept of "educational sociology", explaining what this essentially is, and what its place is within general "theoretical sociology" and within educational theory. He considered that the most important tasks of educational sociology were: to analyse the state and the "natural roots" of the national educational system; to bring out the correlation of educational principles to "the correct forward movement" to the aims of communism; to explain and critically analyse bourgeois educational theories, and to counterpoise to these an educational theory "which flows from the principles of socialism". Lunacharsky described the "sociological sense" of the Soviet unified labour school as being "the reflection of the principles of Soviet democracy", and he gave a clearcut formulation of the Marxist view on the nature and objects of the labour school.

Making his contribution to answering one of the most hotly debated questions of that period—the relationship between the social environment and the school—Lunacharsky in this article asserted the active, motive part to be played by the school, its right and duty to intervene in the life of society and to oppose undesirable influences arising from it. More than this—emphatically stated Lunacharsky, carrying on the best traditions of progressive Russian educational thought—"the school as an educative institution of the state, must become filled with the new spirit sooner than is the case with the life of society in general, it must rise above the petty things of daily living, from it must come the truly educative forces. The school must correct the distortions forced upon the child by life".

1. See Note 16 to "Speech at the First All-Russia Congress on Education".

2. Showing up bourgeois democracy in its true colours is a theme of major importance in Karl Marx's work. "All his life," wrote Lenin, "Marx fought most of all the illusions of petty-bourgeois democracy and bourgeois democracy. Marx scoffed most of all at empty talk of freedom and equality, when it serves as a screen for the freedom of the workers to starve to death, or the equality between the one who sells his labour-power and the bourgeois who allegedly freely purchases that labour in the open market as if from an equal, and so forth. Marx explains all this in his economic works" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 199).

3. Lunacharsky has in mind Lenin's statement that "everyone, having performed as much social labour as another, receives an equal share of the social product..." (V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 470)

4. *Herriot, Édouard* (1872-1952)—French politician, publicist, historian, writer; member of the Académie Française from 1947. Became a parliamentary deputy in 1919, occupied ministerial posts at various times; in 1924-25 and 1932 was Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs. In 1924, the Herriot government established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and in 1932 signed a pact of non-aggression with the USSR. At the time of the occupation of France by Nazi troops, Herriot supported the resistance of national forces to the invaders. The years 1942-45 Herriot spent in a German concentration camp, and was liberated by the Soviet Army.

In the 1920s, there was a movement in France in favour of the "new education", which tried to popularise the idea of creating a school which would educate all children up to the age of eighteen. In 1924, the Herriot government set up a commission to produce a draft law embodying this idea. The draft, when produced, was rejected by the French parliament in 1927.

5. Lunacharsky is referring to Karl Marx's *Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council*, in which Point 4 sets out Marx's views on education, on the tasks and principles of the polytechnical labour school. These *Instructions* were approved as a resolution at the Geneva Congress of the First Internationale, 3-8 September, 1866. The same Congress approved the Constitution and Rules of the International Working Men's Association. (See: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in 3 volumes, Vol. 2, p. 77)

6. In the *Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council on Particular Questions* Karl Marx stressed that "the combination of paid productive labour, mental education, bodily exercise and polytechnic training will raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle classes". (Op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 81).

7. Lunacharsky is referring to *Schools of Tomorrow*, by J. and E. Dewey, which describes the experience gained in nine of the best, in the authors' opinion, schools in America (a Russian edition of this book appeared in Moscow in 1922). See also Note 7 to "What Kind of School Does the Proletarian State Need?"

8. The reference is to N. M. Tulaikov's book *Selskokhozyaistvenniye kolledzhi (vuzi) Soyedinyonnykh Shtatov* [Agricultural Colleges (of higher education) in the United States], Moscow, 1924.

9. *The First Experimental Station for Education* was a group of model-cum-experimental institutions under the Commissariat for Education of the Russian Federation, set up in 1919 by the leading Soviet educationist S. T. Shatsky (1879-1934). It consisted of two sections: a country section in Kaluga Province, and an urban one in Moscow. The country section included 13 first-stage schools, one

second-stage school, and 4 kindergartens. The teachers' collective of the First Experimental Station for Education, under Shatsky's leadership, took an active part in socialist transformation of the countryside, and carried out a great deal of work on doing away with illiteracy and providing political education for the local inhabitants, and in improving general and cultural conditions of life for the peasants. The work of the Station continued until 1936.

10. Lunacharsky refers to a passage in Lenin's speech to the Third Congress of the Young Communist League, on 20 October, 1920: "...the generation of those who are now fifteen years old... should tackle all its educational tasks in such a way that every day, in every village and city, the young people shall engage in the practical solution of some problem of labour in common, even though the smallest or the simplest. The success of communist construction will be assured when this is done in every village, as communist emulation develops and the youth prove that they can unite their labour". (V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 299)

11. *The Young Pioneers*—a mass voluntary organisation for children of 10 to 15 years of age; this was set up in May 1922. A year later, 1923-24, the first groups of Oktyabryata came into being—voluntary groups of schoolchildren aged 7 to 9, attached to Pioneer companies in schools, with the aim of preparing children for entry to the Pioneers (the first groups formed of these younger children were made up of those born in the year of the October Revolution, 1917, hence the name Oktyabryata, or "children of October").

In October 1922, at the Fifth Congress of the Young Communist League, the *Statute on the Work of the Pioneer Organisation* was approved, which marked out the main tasks of Pioneer work, its content and methods. In 1924, the Pioneers were honoured by Lenin's name being attached to their organisation, which thus became the Lenin Pioneer Organisation. By this time it had become a truly mass organisation for children, with more than one and a half million members. A directive of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), of 4 August, 1924, emphasised that the basic aim of the movement was "to be a school of Communist education".

In his article "The Children's Movement and Communist Education" (1924), Lunacharsky noted that the Pioneer movement brought children into the thick of what went on in society and integrated them organically with the work of the people as a whole, with the people's work to build socialism. It gave children "a form of collective work... in ways not over-extending the strength of children, but enabling them to be of perceptive and useful service to society".

The Pioneer organisation has played and still continues to play a major part in the Communist education of successive generations; it is an important factor, giving them a firm ideological grounding and drawing them into active participation in the social and

political life of the country. At the present time the Pioneer organisation unites more than 25,000,000 children and young people.

12. Other works by Lunacharsky which deal with problems of the education of a new intelligentsia, drawn from the workers and peasants, are: *The Intelligentsia, Its Past, Present and Future* (1924), and *The Intelligentsia and Religion* (1925), as well as many others.

Education of the New Man

Lecture delivered on 23 May, 1928, in Leningrad

The problems of education in its various aspects have been treated by Lunacharsky in many works which the reader has already met in the pages of this present volume. But they are dealt with most fully and comprehensively in two speeches which he made in 1928—"Education of the New Man" and "The Educational Tasks of the Soviet School". These speeches to some extent summed up his thinking on the subject. They provide a synthesis of Lunacharsky's views on the fundamental aims of communist education.

The different audiences for which the lecture "Education of the New Man" and the report "The Educational Tasks of the Soviet School" were intended to determine their differing characters and the differing accentuation on various points which they contain. The lecture is a model of true educational propaganda, while the report is a no less brilliant example of profound theoretical investigation of the most important problems of education. Differing in their genre and composition, but one in their idea and aim, in their line of advance, these two works rightfully form part of Soviet educational literature's fund of "golden classics".

At the end of the 1920s issues of communist moral education had become particularly high on the order of the day. Socialist reconstruction of the economy meant that there was a firm advance against capitalist elements taking place on all fronts, including that of education. After the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party (1927), which had underlined the vital need to strengthen the revolutionary, class nature of educational work, the tasks of communist education became a subject enjoying much attention in many circles of society. The role of the school in the fight for "the new man" becomes a central theme for the press. The Central Board for Social Education (*Glavsotsvos*) noted in its report for 1928 that it was especially noticeable how strongly people felt "the need to increase the importance attached to educational matters", which had come to the forefront "in the course of the last year".

In his lecture on "Education of the New Man" Lunacharsky indicated two "zones of phenomena" which "oblige one to raise one's voice concerning something of a change" in the work of the schools, and which brought "questions of

moral education to the forefront". One of these "zones of phenomena" was the logic of development of the schools themselves: they had now entered into a phase of development at which they could already discharge the tasks of communist education successfully.

Instruction and moral education are two indivisible functions of the school, but their performance does not, however, always proceed in step, with the same degree of success. In periods of break-up of a school system which does not meet the new demands of society's development, the tasks which commonly appear to be of the most immediate importance are those of reviewing the aims and content of education in school—review of curricula and syllabi, of the system of teaching methods used. It is questions of instructional education which receive most attention, in both theoretical and practical work.

The complexity of moral-educational problems shows itself also in the length of time which is required for their solution. For the young Soviet school this complexity was compounded by the fact that in the field of moral education it had no heritage at all to look back to. Whereas in the theory and practice of teaching in school it was possible to find some support in the best of what had been bequeathed by the old school, the old educational theory, here, in this moral-educational field, it was necessary from the very beginning to open up entirely new paths, on the basis of the fundamental principles and aims of communist moral education as formulated in the classics of Marxism and in the resolutions of Party congresses.

To cope with these tasks an accumulation of practical experience and theoretical backing was required, as was re-equipment, ideologically and politically, of the principal, leading actor on the school scene—the teacher, who had to become, as Lunacharsky puts it, "... an engineer working to the finest of tolerances as he constructs that amazing, most finely-wrought primary cell, without which society has no meaning—the human personality". [A. V. Lunacharsky, *Tretii Front* (The Third Front), *Collection of Essays*, Moscow 1925, p. 26.]

The second "zone of phenomena", which Lunacharsky presents as linked with the upward turn in the economy and with the advance of the revolution in culture, included "the exceptionally accelerated tempo of our advance towards producing the new man", and "the exceptionally attentive review now being undergone by the principles and paths we have been following up to now". It was now becoming "of utmost importance", as Lunacharsky notes in the lecture here published, to tackle the problem of educating "the human being of the future" and to work out new, socialist moral standards.

Under the given new conditions it was essential to analyse the experience already gained in moral-educational work, and to make the educational tasks of the Soviet school more

precise and more concrete. It was also essential, over and above that, to define more closely the concept of the final aim towards which all the moral-educational work of the school was directed—the ideal of the new man. This was all the more necessary since, as the country had started to move along the road of industrialisation, there had been some dissemination of views which considered the school as nothing more than an instrument reproducing the labour force, and of concepts which saw “the new America” as the social ideal, and “the man who can fix a screw in properly” as the ideal product of education. These “educational ideals” of the proponents of what Lunacharsky called “the screw-fixing philosophy” (*gaikism*) were closely related to the views of those who saw socialism as “the communalisation of the human being”.

In his lecture Lunacharsky demonstrated the untenability of all these concepts, showing that the new society would need not only “good production workers” but also, and more than all else,—human beings capable of carrying through “the re-ordering of human life”. Socialism presupposes, to use Lunacharsky’s words, not “machinisation” and “communalisation of the human being”, but the full flowering of human individuality, while at the same time all the “human wills” are united to the maximum possible extent into “one single organised force”. This last was the ideal to which education of the young should be directed, and for whose sake “we carry on the work, for whose sake we exist, and without which it would not be worthwhile to live and to work”.

Developing Lenin’s ideas on the role of the school in the transformation of society and of man, emphasising that the socialist school had to become “the first real foretaste of the socialist society”—in this lecture on “Education of the New Man” Lunacharsky gave a profound analysis of the educative tasks of the school and of the content and forms of moral, labour, physical and aesthetic education.

1. The principles of the *polytechnical labour school*, as proclaimed in 1918 at the First All-Russia Congress on Education in its Declaration of the Unified Labour School, required a long period of time and much concentrated work by the Communist Party and the whole Soviet people before they could be realised in practice. They were realised as the socialist reconstruction of the country proceeded, as the economy developed and provided the material basis for the re-organisation of the schools, as the schools themselves developed and became capable of discharging more and more successfully the tasks of communist education of the rising generations. The directive approved in December 1977 by the Central Committee of the CPSU and by the USSR Council of Ministers, “On Further Improvement of the Instruction and Education of Pupils in the General Schools, and their Training for Work”, stressed that today the Soviet general school is “genuinely a school of the whole people, which has consistently put into practice the Leninist

principles of the unified labour polytechnical school". (*Pravda*, 29 December, 1977).

2. See Note 10 to "The Tasks of Education Within the System of Soviet Construction".

3. See Note 6 to "What Kind of School Does the Proletarian State Need?"

4. *The Soviet exhibition on education*, showing the achievements of the Soviet educational system and of Soviet educational studies, was organised in Denmark in 1927, for the tenth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

In later years exhibitions on Soviet education were held abroad on more than one occasion. In 1955, a permanent Soviet exhibition on education was set up in Geneva, under UNESCO.

5. Lunacharsky is referring to a passage in one of Lenin's last works, an article "On Cooperation" (1923): "...cultural revolution would now suffice to make our country a completely socialist country; but it presents immense difficulties of a purely cultural (for we are illiterate) and material character (for to be cultured we must achieve a certain development of the material means of production, must have a certain material base)". (V. I. Lenin, *On Cooperation*, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 475).

6. *Nietzsche, Friedrich* (1844-1900)—German idealist philosopher, who preached the cult of the "superman", the powerful personality standing above all moral rules and trampling the ordinary people harshly underfoot for the satisfaction of his own lust for power. Nietzsche treated the masses of the people with contempt, singing the praises of the "chosen few" and justifying their acts of violence and crimes against morality, their urge to instigate war.

With the name of Nietzsche is linked one of the most reactionary trends in the cultural life of Europe (particularly in Germany) during the first decades of the twentieth century. Nietzscheanism was the result of applying the philosophy and ideology of Nietzsche to the conditions of imperialism; it found its final expression in Nazism. The Nazis proclaimed Nietzsche to be their ideologist, carrying the reactionary tendencies of his teachings to the extreme.

7. Lunacharsky is referring to the elections to the Reichstag in 1928, which showed a considerable increase in the number of votes cast for candidates representing the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties in Germany.

8. An oblique quotation from the *Divine Comedy*, by the great Italian poet Dante Alighieri (1265-1321): "Abandon hope, all ye who enter here"—the inscription over the gates of Hell. (*Divine Comedy*, Canto 3, "Hell").

9. See Note 3 to "The Tasks of Education Within the System of Soviet Construction".

10. Lunacharsky is referring to Lenin's speech at the First All-Russia Congress of Workers in Education, 28 August, 1918. Emphasising the role to be played by the new, socialist school in the building of a socialist society, Lenin noted in this speech that the creation of such a school was one of the important "component parts of the struggle we are now waging". "...Our work in the sphere of education is part of the struggle for overthrowing the bourgeoisie," said Lenin, "...the working people are thirsting for knowledge because they need it to win... they see how indispensable education is for the victorious conclusion of their struggle." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 87-88.)

11. On 26 November, 1925 Lunacharsky delivered a report, at the invitation of the German Society of Friends of the New Russia, in the Beethoven Hall in Berlin. A report on this meeting appeared in the journal *Narodnoye Prosveshcheniye* (People's Education), 1926, Nos. 4-5, pp. 253-256.

12. In his pamphlet *What Is Art?* Lew Tolstoy wrote: "To evoke in oneself a feeling already experienced and, having evoked it, to transmit it by means of movements, lines, sounds, and images conveyed in words, in such a way that others experience the same feeling—that is the activities called art. Art is human activities consisting in one man consciously, by means of certain outward signals, conveying to another man the feelings he has experienced, and in other people having these feelings transmitted to them and living them over again." (L. N. Tolstoy, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1961, p. 65.)

13. *Scouting*—one of the most widespread bourgeois forms of children's and youth movement; arose in 1907 on the initiative of an English colonel, R. Baden-Powell. The educative system on which it is based is expounded in Baden-Powell's book *Aids to Scouting* (1898).

In Russia, the Boy Scout movement started in 1909. In 1919, the Second Congress of the Young Communist League disbanded the Scouts as being an organisation inappropriate to the tasks of communist education of young people. The leadership of the People's Commissariat for Education supported this decision by the League. While rejecting the bourgeois character of the Scouts, however, the Commissariat did point to the desirability of utilising some of the methods of Scouting in the work of the communist movements for children and young people.

"Scouting," wrote N. K. Krupskaya in 1922 in an article on "The Young Communist League and the Boy Scouts", "has an irresistible attraction for youngsters, there is something in it which gives them satisfaction, which attaches them to that organisation. That something is *its method of approach to the youngster*." (N. K. Krupskaya, *Works on Education*, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1959, p. 37, in Russian). The strong points of the Boy Scout movement Krupskaya considered to be its careful study of the psychology and interests of children, its encouragement of the children's own initiative, its love of travel, heroism, romantic adventure, its use of lively forms of activi-

ties, its colourful and attractive ceremonies. "The Young Communist League must," emphasised Krupskaya, "bring these methods of work into its own practice as quickly as possible." (op. cit., p. 48.)

14. Lunacharsky repeatedly attacked the bourgeois norms of family life, the enslavement of women within the family, the contemptuous attitude shown towards women. In an article of 1926 he wrote: "We need the man who is aflame with life, who sees his young love, his relationship with a woman, as one of the moments of brightness and great significance in his life. He is sparing with passion and tenderness, but then his "romances" are truly pure, profound and beautiful; they do not tear apart the web of his relationship to the revolution, to his comrades, to the world at large, they are harmoniously integrated into those relationships." [*Krasnaya Gazeta* (Red Gazette), 26 July, 1926.]

The Educational Tasks of the Soviet School

*Report delivered to a conference of teachers
of social studies, on 27 June, 1928*

The report here published has many points of similarity—in aims, problems dealt with and ideas expressed—with the lecture on "Education of the New Man", given before a different type of audience one month before the conference of social studies for teachers took place. In his report Lunacharsky concentrated his attention on theoretical analysis of the educational tasks of the school, on the nodal problems of educational theory: the social role of education and its class nature; the aims of communist education in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the functions, tasks, direction and method of educational work in the schools at the new stage of building socialism then reached. Under the conditions of full-scale building of socialism, the tasks of education become, in Lunacharsky's words, "...the pre-condition for further economic and political successes, not to mention that it is they that bring about the transformation of human life which gives true meaning to the whole movement of the proletariat". At the new stage of that period, when in Lunacharsky's words "communist public opinion had attained some maturity", when it was vital to "take more energetic steps to win the children", a task which then assumed great importance was that of uniting the efforts of school, public opinion and family in working on the educative process. In delineating this task Lunacharsky noted that these new times brought with them new demands upon the teacher, and new demands upon educational science, which must be based upon "precise pedagogical knowledge". "The pointers which our leaders have given us" were, as Lunacharsky said, a reliable compass to point us along the way to building the new school. But in order to complete this

"grandiose edifice", it was not enough "merely to have a compass". It was essential that theoretical studies in depth should be made of the problems of education, and primarily of the problems of communist moral education.

Lunacharsky considered that the most important of these problems was the interaction of collective and individual, the formation of the personality within the collective. Lunacharsky asserted that the main characteristic of the new man must be collectivism, thinking of oneself not as "I" but as "we", and he again (as in the lecture "Education of the New Man") insistently emphasised that education of an independent, creative individual (its formation being grounded "on a collective basis") is "the guarantee of widely applied division of labour within society", and the guarantee of society's moral health and cultural richness.

Lunacharsky's report overflows with ideas that fully retain their urgency today. One of them, in particular, among those which still have a very real contemporary meaning, is the idea of unity, of the close mutual link-up between instructional teaching and moral education. The content put into subject teaching in schools is, as Lunacharsky says "a great educative force", it "opens up a whole complex of educative work". Instruction, he points out, must be directed towards the formation of a materialist, Marxist world outlook, and the formation of this outlook must proceed "cyclically, starting with simpler forms and gradually passing on to more complete ones". It is no less important, in Lunacharsky's opinion, to make instruction an active force in forming the child's character. Instruction must be "lively, moving and therefore educative".

No less important today is Lunacharsky's opinion on the most significant part played by labour education in the general process of educating youngsters in a communist way. Stressing that "the importance of labour in education is enormous", Lunacharsky in this report considers "the issue of labour in the school" under three aspects—labour methods and labour approach in teaching; the teaching of actual labour processes; and the morally educative role of labour. Of particular interest are Lunacharsky's ideas on the functions of labour education and learning work processes within the formation of the world outlook. In contemporary Soviet educational thinking, and in the practice of Soviet schools today, the theme of labour education and teaching work processes is one of the most important. The decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the USSR Council of Ministers on the schools, approved in December 1977, maps out a broad programme of modernisation of labour education and instruction, of all-round improvement in the preparation for useful productive work given to school pupils.

Lunacharsky's view of the nature and tasks of aesthetic education is likewise extremely fertile and full of pointers for the future. The idea (put forward in the lecture "Education of the New Man") that the basic aim of aesthetic

education is to educate "the human emotions" (*not* only to develop artistic abilities and the ability to appreciate real life and works of art) is further developed in the work now under consideration. Noting the profound influence which emotional experience exerts upon character formation, Lunacharsky emphasises that "the basic mode of use" of aesthetic education is to organise emotional experiences in such a way that they will assist the formation of communist character traits, and educate a person "powerfully and lastingly" in the spirit of communist ideals. Lunacharsky views aesthetic education "as one of the methods of social education". And socio-political education is, in his words, "the axis" around which everything done in the field of education must be "connected up".

In the light of the ideas so popular today about "on-going" or "developing" education, it is particularly interesting to see what Lunacharsky has to say, in the work under discussion, on the need to acquaint even children of the younger age-groups with a wide range of scientific concepts, and to note his idea that "even the smallest child can be told the history of culture, as a glorious fairy-tale".

1. Lenin emphasised on numerous occasions that the building of socialism "... can be achieved only by slow, persistent work to re-educate the masses" (V. I. Lenin, "Draft Programme of R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 112). In his speech to a conference of education workers on 3 November, 1920, it is the main ideas of this which Lunacharsky is paraphrasing, Lenin said: "We do not hold the Utopian view that the working masses are ready for a socialist society... Education workers, and the Communist Party as the vanguard in the struggle, should consider it their fundamental task to help enlighten and instruct the working masses, in order to cast off the old ways and habituated routine we have inherited from the old system.... This fundamental task of the entire socialist revolution should never be neglected during consideration of particular problems...." (V. I. Lenin, "Speech delivered at All-Russia Conference of Political Education of Workers of Gubernia and Uyezds Departments, November 3, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 365.)

2. Lunacharsky is referring to the following, from Lenin's speech of 20 January, 1919 to the Second All-Russia Trade Union Congress,—"The workers were never separated by a Great Wall of China from the old society. And they have preserved a good deal of the traditional mentality of capitalist society. The workers are building a new society without themselves having become new people, or cleansed of the filth of the old world; they are still standing up to their knees in that filth. We can only dream of clearing that filth away. It would be utterly Utopian to think this could be done all at once". (V. I. Lenin, "Report at the Second All-Russia Trade Union Congress", January 20, 1919; *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 424-25.)

3. *Schools of the free child*—schools organising their work on the basis of the theory of "free education" (a trend in bourgeois educational thought of the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century; its ideal was free development, unhindered by any limitations, of the child's powers and abilities—the full unfolding of the individual). The ideas of "free education" have their source in the theory of natural education developed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who opposed the authoritarian educational methods prevalent in the schools in his day.

In Russia the ideas of "free education" were partially put into practice in the "House of the Free Child" which was opened in Moscow in 1906 and continued to function until 1909.

4. Lunacharsky is alluding to the following passage in Marx's *Capital*: "A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality". (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 174.)

5. See Note 8 to the article "The Philosophy of the School and the Revolution".

6. The Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, approved by an extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 7 October, 1977, emphasises that in the USSR today "a developed socialist society has been built.... It is a society of mature socialist social relations, in which, on the basis of the drawing together of all classes and social strata and of the juridical and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities and their fraternal cooperation, a new historical community of people has been formed—the Soviet people".

"Developed socialist society," says the Constitution, "is a natural, logical stage on the road to communism."

"The supreme goal of the Soviet state is the building of a classless communist society in which there will be public, communist self-government...." [*Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1977, p. 13-14 (Eng. ed.).]

7. See article *On the Class School* and Note 11 to this article.

8. *Cameral* or *chamber* (government office) *school*—a form of education organised in pre-revolutionary Russia of the first half of the nineteenth century; its purpose was "to train person capable of serving in the economic or administrative services".

9. *Machism*—a subjectivist-idealist trend in philosophy and the methodology of science, which came into being early in the twentieth century under the influence of the work of the Austrian physicist and philosopher *Ernst Mach* (1838-1916) and his followers. In

keeping with the spirit of subjective idealism, the Machists asserted that the world is "a complex of sensations", and that the task of science, therefore, is merely to describe those sensations. Machism set up to be "the philosophy of the natural sciences" and tried to take up a position in philosophy "above party considerations"—the parties being the materialists and the idealists. These pretensions, and the actually subjective-idealist nature of Machism, were subjected to sharp criticism by V. I. Lenin in his *Materialism and Empiriocriticism* (1909).

10. *Solipsism*—an extreme form of subjective idealism, according to which the only undoubted reality is man and his consciousness, while the objective world exists only in the consciousness of the individual. Also characteristic of solipsism is the assertion that sensation is the only source of perception. A critique of solipsism is given by V. I. Lenin in *Materialism and Empiriocriticism*.

11. Lunacharsky has in mind the ideas expressed by Engels in *Anti-Dühring* (1877-78). In this work (Section 3, *Socialism*) Engels wrote: "...just as the older manufacture, in its time, and handicraft, becoming more developed under its influence, had come into collision with the feudal trammels of the guilds, so now modern industry, in its more complete development, comes into collision with the bounds within which the capitalistic mode of production holds it confined. The new productive forces have already outgrown the capitalistic mode of using them. And this conflict between productive forces and modes of production is not a conflict engendered in the mind of man.... It exists, in fact, objectively, outside us, independently of the will and actions even of the men who have brought it on. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex, in thought, of this conflict in fact; its ideal reflection in the minds, first, of the class directly suffering under it, the working class." (Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1978, Progress Publishers, pp. 324-25.)

12. *Pavlov, Ivan* (1849-1936)—eminent Soviet physiologist, creator of the materialist theory of higher nervous activities. The foundation of his consistent materialist approach to the study of the higher functions of the brain, in animals and in man, was his theory of "conditioned reflexes"—complex accommodatory reactions of an organism, which arise in response to particular conditions—hence the name.

13. *Tretyakov Art Gallery*, in Moscow—the largest collection of Russian and Soviet art in existence; it takes its name from its founder, P. M. Tretyakov, a major figure in the Russian art world (1832-1898). Tretyakov, who began to collect paintings in 1856, set himself the aim of creating a gallery of national art which would be accessible to all. In 1892 he presented his collection to the city of Moscow. In 1918 the Tretyakov Gallery was nationalised. During the years of Soviet power, its stock has been multiplied more than tenfold.

NAME INDEX

A

Alexander II 289

B

Baden-Powell, R. 236, 321
 Barbusse, H. 265
 Bebel, A. 42, 278
 Beethoven, L. 72
 Bergson, H. 198, 312
 Blonsky, P. P. 106, 291, 313
 Borodin, A. P. 48, 280
 Brecht, B. 265
 Brezhnev, L. I. 270
 Briand, A. 87, 285-286
 Buisson, F. 91, 288

C

Catherine II 306
 Chapaev, V. 313
 Chernov, V. M. 87, 286
 Chernyshevsky, N. 274
 Condorcet, M. J. A. N. 42, 164,
 277

D

Dante, A. 320
 Delyanov, I. D. 288
 Dewey, E. 315
 Dewey, J. 127, 212, 218, 298,
 315
 Dobrolyubov, N. 274

E

Engels, F. 177, 203, 222, 254,
 255, 305, 326

F

Feuerbach, L. 45, 280
 Fichte, J. G. 164, 248, 303
 Foerster, F. W. 36, 37, 39, 91,
 157, 158, 159, 230, 276
 Froebel, F. 95, 164, 290
 Fülöp-Miller 238
 Furmanov, D. 199, 313

G

Galliffet 287
 Gogol, N. 201, 313
 Gorky, M. 264

H

Hamp, P. 198, 313
 Herbart, J. F. 95, 164, 290
 Herriot, E. 209, 315
 Hokusai 280
 Humboldt, W. 34, 38, 276

J

Jefferson, T. 269

K

Kalashnikov, A. G. 106, 291
 Kautsky, K. 88, 287
 Kolesnikova, N. 309
 Konovalov, A. I. 87, 286
 Kordes, V. 221
 Krupskaya, N. K. 78, 135,
 178, 181, 187, 281, 284, 302,
 306, 308, 309, 313, 321-322

L

- Lassalle, F. 62, 207, 281
 Lenin, V. I. 5, 29, 120, 140, 143,
 174, 193, 203, 208, 216, 221,
 227, 236, 237, 243, 244, 264,
 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271,
 273, 276, 282, 283, 284, 286,
 287, 291, 292, 294, 297, 300,
 308-309, 311, 314, 315, 316,
 320, 321, 324, 325, 326
 Lepeletier, L. M. 42, 164, 277
 Lloyd George, D. 87, 286
 Löbe 230
 Luther, M. 168, 303
 Lvov, G. E. 87, 286

M

- Mach, E. 325
 Malthus, T. 69, 284
 Marx, K. 21, 69, 82, 127, 162,
 190, 206, 207, 210, 211, 217,
 222, 226, 242-243, 247, 254,
 273, 276, 284, 314, 315, 325
 Maupassant, G. 50, 280
 Millerand, A. E. 87, 286-287
 Molière 146, 302
 Montaigne, M. 42, 277

N

- Natorp, P. 38, 174, 273, 305
 Nicholas II (Nikolai Romanov)
 26, 274
 Nietzsche, F. 223, 320

P

- Paulsen, F. 90-91, 156, 157, 288,
 289
 Pavlov, I. 256, 326
 Pestalozzi, J. H. 38, 95, 164,
 277, 290
 Peter the Great 153, 300
 Plato 34, 276
 Potyomkin, G. A. 306
 Pushkin, A. 201, 280, 313

R

- Ricardo, D. 69, 284
 Robespierre, M. 235, 277
 Rolland, R. 265
 Rousseau, J.-J. 95, 164, 289-290,
 325

S

- Schiller, F. 42, 278
 Shatsky, S. T. 313, 315
 Shaw, B. 265
 Shchedrin, M. E. (Saltykov) 88,
 287
 Smith, A. 36, 69, 276
 Sverdlov, Y. 284

T

- Talleyrand, C. M. 164, 302
 Tereshchenko, I. I. 87, 286
 Tolstoi, D. A. 91, 288
 Tolstoy, L. N. 199-200, 234, 291,
 313, 321
 Tretyakov, P. M. 327
 Tsereteli, I. G. 87, 286
 Tulaikov, N. M. 212, 315

U

- Uspensky, G. 198, 312-313

V

- Valuyev, P. A. 289
 Vladimir Ilyich (see Lenin V. I.)
 Vorovsky, V. 306

W

- Wilhelm II 22, 93, 158, 252

Z

- Zernov 141

